# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES ADVISORY PANEL MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 2008

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m. in the Hilton Hotel, 8727 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, Maryland.

This transcript produced from audio cassette tapes provided by DOC NOAA.

2

# INDEX

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Reauthorization Act Update	and 4
Pelagic Longline Research and Fishery Update	49
Tuna Longline Permit/Workshop Proposed Rule Presentation	89
Permit Reform Presentation	146
Permit Reform Report Back/ Group Discussions	170
International Trade Permit Proposed Rule Presentation	220
Caribbean Amendment Presentation	246

# P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:30 a.m.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good morning. Let's go ahead and get started. We're going to start this morning with an update on the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act. We speakers that will do different presentations. We have Laura Cimo from the Office of International Sales who will give us a presentation on the international position, Ise, who's in our office of and Jennifer sustainable fisheries, domestic division on some of the other ACL and I think some updates on some of the other aspects of the MSRA.

And I also wanted to let folks know we're going to have a slight change in the agenda. Instead of having the Greenstick presentation this morning, we're going to switch out and have the project on the research fishery update this morning and have the Greenstick presentation tomorrow morning.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I just wanted to let folks know about that 1 2 ahead of time. So with that, I'll turn it over to 3 4 Laura. CIMO: Thanks, Margo. 5 MS. Good 6 morning, everybody. Well, as everbody knows, about a 7 8 year ago, actually over a year ago, Congress the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization 9 passes 10 Act, and among the provisions of the Act, there several international 11 are new requirements that we have to undertake, and, 12 13 basically, I wanted today just give you a brief overview again of the provisions that we 14 15 have the implement, give you a quick update on 16 the status of implementation, then I guess we can answer questions at the end, or however 17 Margo would like to do this. 18 19 So just to give you a quick run-20

So just to give you a quick runthrough of the requirements of the Act, basically, under the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act the United States is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

21

required to take actions to address international over-fishing. We have to take action strengthen international to our organizations that have fisheries management oversight. We have to take action to combat illegal, unreported, unregulated fishing, and have to reduce bycatch of protected living resources, which includes marine mammals and sea turtles.

One other key provision of the Act, we have to submit a bi-annual report to Congress and the first report is due on January 12, 2009, and we have to include, among other things in the report, the key is a list of nations whose vessels are engaged in IUU fishing or bycatch of protected marine living resources.

So after identification of those nations, the U.S. government is going to notify nations of their identification and make sure that they're aware of the Act's requirements to address IUU fishing and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

bycatch. Then the United States is required to initiate consultations with those nations to address those activities outlined in the bi-annual report. We have to then notify all the relevant international organizations of our U.S. actions so we can in to address IU fishing. And we finally have to seek international agreements to reduce bycatch of protected living marine resources.

The next step in the process under the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act is the Secretary has Commerce certify for those nations that have been identified whether they're taking appropriate corrective action to address the IU fishing activities bycatch of protected living or And, essentially, marine resources. certification process will require us to make either a positive or a negative certification.

A positive certification is a reminder, basically, that the nations have taken the appropriate corrective action, and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

basically what that means if they've taken appropriate action, then they're fine. They get a green light so to speak.

Negative certification on the other hand basically demonstrates that they failed to meet the standards in the Act to address IU fishing and bycatch. And the effects of that are that essentially are authorized to deny the entry of fishing vessels from that nation to our U.S. ports. And with exceptions, we are authorized to prohibit the importations of certain fish or fish products from that country.

So that just was a quick update on the activities that we are undertaking under the Act. So I'm just going to give you right now sort of a quick status update.

First of all, we are in the process of developing a proposed rule to implement the identification and certification procedure.

And I think a lot of you, where I'm looking at I see some familiar faces, I know that you're

familiar with the fact we've already produced an annual -- a report based on the prior support in January of 2008, and so some of this information I know you guys have already been made aware of. But, again, I just want to run through this quickly.

We did publish an A&PR in June of 2007 and solicited public comments that were used in development of the proposed rule, and we held three public meetings in July of 2007. So, again, now the proposed rule is clearly undergoing internal review.

The next most important critical milestone for implementation of the first biannual report to Congress, and what we are doing, again, is we're updating that progress report that most of you have probably because, again, have to include U.S. we actions that have been taken to address IU international fishing and bycatch at the But the most important thing that level. we're focusing on in the interim is basically

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

identifying those nations whose efforts are engaged in IU fishing and bycatch, and what we currently have out for public review is we have information dissertation notice, and I have brought copies. They're in the back of the room.

What we're asking for is input from public other countries, the and NGOs, industry, on any activities that we can information we should use in this identification process. I just want emphasize that this is really a critical time.

A lot of folks have come to us and basically mentioned that they'd like us to evaluate certain activities that certain countries are undertaking, and, at this point, we have yet really to receive a lot of information. So I guess I'm making a plea out to folks that, if you have information, now is the time to send it forward to NOAA fisheries.

I am a point of contact on that so you can send it directly to me, and our

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

deadline is April 21<sup>st</sup>, so it's right around the corner. So to the extent that folks, again, do have information, if you could please bring that forward, we would greatly appreciate it.

And then next step, basically, we are going to be collaborating with our other federal partners as state department and U.S. trade representative colleagues in this process of identification.

I didn't mention that it was a key item of the Act is that there's a provision of requirements to undertake international cooperation and assistance. And this is kind of a new set of activities for NOAA fisheries. In the past we've given little bits money for basically bycatch reduction activities, et cetera. But we're hoping to really ramp up these activities in the coming years. And so far in 2007 with some of the monies we've already received, we have basically supported workshops on methods to prevent and mitigate

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

incidental cases of marine turtles, mammals, sea birds, and other resources. We've provided some funds for workshops for respond to marine mammal strandings, and we're trying to basically take action to strengthen enforcement and prevent IU fishing.

So in conclusion, this Magnuson-Stevens authorization. It provides a system with real opportunities and challenges improve global international fisheries, basically, we're trying to, emphasize that this is believe we multilateral process is the way to address IU fishing and bycatch. So we are reimplementing We are kind of trying to emphasize the Act. moving forward in а bilateral and а multilateral basis.

And interpretation of that is going to require us to have continued commitment to strengthening our international fisheries organizations and building capacity in other countries to address these activities, i.e.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fishing and bycatch.

And just as a reminder, I think you guys have seen this before, but, again, this is the website that our office of sustainable fisheries has developed for Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization implementation, and this is where you can find everything from when we had the proposed rule out for the public comment. We'll be posting it here. We have the information solicitation notices also at this site and any other updates.

Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Thanks. Gail Johnson. The deadline you said is right around the corner, but I presume that this is a yearly kind of thing and this happened pretty fast and a lot of people aren't out. So if there is something to be told to you, I guess it if was after April, it would go for next year. Is that right?

MS. CIMO: I think what we'll try to do to the extent possible, if there is

1	information, like I say, I certainly wouldn't
2	discourage you from sending it even after the
3	April 21 <sup>st</sup> time line. The one concern we have
4	is that we're going to have to basically take
5	information that we get and seek to
6	corroborate and verify information. So we
7	need to have enough time to do that in order
8	to include that information in the biannual
9	report to Congress. So certainly I wouldn't -
10	- even thought April 21 <sup>st</sup> is our deadline so to
11	speak, I certainly also wouldn't discourage
12	you from sending information because if we
13	to the extent that we can verify and
14	corroborate information, we can include it in
15	this round of identifications. But, if not,
16	you're correct, we'll basically have to use
17	them in the second process, which would be in
18	the biannual report to Congress that's due in
19	January 2011.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE #1: Thank you. Good morning, Laura. And further to Gail's comment, is it out of the question to ask for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

20

21

an extension to the public comment period?

MS. CIMO: No, actually it's not, and we have basically been considering whether or not an extension would be warranted, and, frankly, I appreciate the comment and question because we've been asking people whether it would be appropriate and have yet to really hear that that would be a worthwhile endeavor. So if folks think that's important, then I'll take that back to our folks at NOAA fisheries.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE #1: I think it would. And if I could follow up on a couple of points that were made at the ICAD advisory committee, which was only on March 27<sup>th</sup> when we had this same discussion. There was a lot of support for trying to see what the possibility would be of getting a preliminary report, preliminary white paper, or whatever you want to call it, in time for the ICAD meeting identifying what you've identified to date in terms of IUU so that we could use that whether formally in plenary sessions or whether the

commissioners could use it in smaller group negotiation, it would be very helpful for us to have that. So I'll just repeat that if there's any piece of document you can get, even if it has to stay in the hands of the commissioners only, that that could be a very useful tool for what's going to be a very difficult meeting for us.

The other points I wanted to make was it's really hard, you know, when you -for you -- well, the government is basically coming to us and asking us for information on IUU fishing, when probably the most valuable and relevant sources of information that could identify that are import trade statistics that are being maintained by the government that some of us don't really -- we certainly don't have the expertise in handling the databases that, for example, a Chris Rogers would have within international. But we kind of have to rely a bit on you as well as, for example, the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

identified the activity that was taking place
in Trinidad, which clearly is moving in the

direction of finding some IUU.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The other major source that we'd be commenting on is if you look at the petition, obviously, from the Center for Biological Diversity, if I said that right, where they're asking under the Marine Mammal Protection Act to ban imports from IUU fishing countries, they seem to have gotten some excellent intelligence on what's happening in the Philippines Singapore, Taiwan, Singapore, connection in the IUU fishing that's continuing there, including mislabeling big-eye caught from the Atlantic that truly caught from the Indian Ocean, et cetera, et cetera. So in that document there's a good five or six pages of what appears to be solid information that could be pursued to find it.

And the other suggestion that several of my members have made to me is can't we avail ourselves of NOAA satellite, you

know, imagery to try to track some of the names of some of these vessels that are actively involved, particularly in Trinidad. I mean we all know they can read license plates numbers off the back of cars now with satellites, so surely the vessel names or photos of the vessels so that they can be then identified by land would be helpful in moving

than that, we really find Other ourselves in a position where there's a few dealers that can be helpful and we put them to try to request out to get the information. But, basically, the people that handle the imports first, FDA, and then whatever data retrieval and systematic systems the various collection between agencies that handle that, that's really where you're going to get, you know, information on the countries that are actually participating in it.

MS. CIMO: Thanks so much, Rich. I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

forward.

really appreciate it. And I think, like I said, you've brought up a lot of good points and, frankly, we've been trying to talk to enforcement so they are our partners in this effort, so we have been under discussion and sort of options and opportunities, so that, basically, we've been talking about the same things that you've brought up.

for thanks mentioning, And obviously, the swordfish petition. We've also taken that under consideration as well. So all your points well taken and are appreciated.

(Off mic speaking.)

MS. ISE: Hi. My name is Jennifer Ise and I'm here to provide an update on our efforts to develop guidance on the annual catch limit provisions that were included in the MSRA and how we plan to include that guidance in the national standard one guideline. So I'll quickly run through some of the MSA requirements related to overfishing

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and the annual catch limit guideline.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Quick recap of national standard one requires that conservation and management measures prevent overfishing while achieving optimum yield in each fishery. And in 2007 the MSRA added а requirement the MSPs establish a mechanism for specifying annual catch limits in the plan regulations or annual specifications level such that at а overfishing does not occur in the fishery and including measures to ensure accountability.

annual catch limits may not The exceed a council's scientific and statistical committee's fishing level recommendation and secretarial FMPs this could apply recommendations of agency scientists or peer review process. The annual catch limits are required for all managed fisheries with two statutory exemptions, one regarding species life cycles unless annual they subject to overfishing, and stocks that managed under an international agreement to

which the U.S. is a party. The annual catch limits are required in fishing year 2010 per stocks that are subject to overfishing and in 2011 for all other stocks.

The MSRA revised MSA section 304E, which is the rebuilding section, effective July 2009. Within two years of an overfish or notification, approaching overfish status management measures must be prepared and implemented to immediately end overfishing, rebuild affected stocks, and prevent overfishing.

The MSRA added a new section called international overfishing that will apply in lieu of section 304E if the secretary determines that a stock is overfished or approaching overfished due to excessive international fishing pressure and for which there management to are no measures overfishing under an international agreement to which the U.S. is a party. And so the secretary, with the Secretary of State, should

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

immediately take action to end overfishing at the international level and within one year the secretary or appropriate counsel should recommend domestic regulations to address the relative impact of U.S. vessels on the stock and recommend to the Secretary of State and Congress international actions to end overfishing and rebuild taking into account the relative impact of other nation vessels

and vessels of the U.S.

updating the So national we're quidelines address standard to these provisions, and, specifically, we want to add guidance on the annual catch limits and the accountability acceptable measures and biological catch which is a new requirement added by MSRA in section 302 of the MSA, which requires that council's scientific and statistical committees provide ABC an recommendation as part of their scientific advice.

So we want to explain these new

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

requirements and their relationship to existing requirements for maximum sustainable yield and optimal yield and the status determination criteria for overfishing and overfished.

So last winter we solicited public comments about developing the quidance annual catch limits, and some themes that emerged from the comments include improving fishery status; developing more guidance on optimum yield and how to incorporate ecosystem considerations; the role of scientific advice, specifically with the SSC; allowing managers accessibility and how they develop the annual catch limits and accountability measures; the preference for in-season adjustments to corrective ones with regard to accountability measures; the ACLs that address rebuilding, not just overfishing; and to protect sectors from each other; and show ongoing review of management effectiveness and address how ACLs might work for stocks that are shared in state

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

waters.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

working to develop So in the quidance, we have several objectives. One is to ensure that the guidelines provide national also allow for consistency, but the flexibility to account for diversity in U.S. fisheries, such as biological and ecological, different management approaches, different levels of scientific knowledge about each οf the stocks, the different catch monitoring capabilities, the overlap management jurisdiction systems, stocks, the different the users that are harvesting the stocks. So our goal is to create strong, yet flexible guidelines to account for this diversity.

So the MSA does not define annual catch limits, so that's one of our objectives is to create a definition. Some things we've considered including all sources of fishing mortality where that's possible; having them be optional to set for multiple year periods;

maybe be a numerical annual value that's set in weight or numbers of fish. It could be optional to subdivide an ACL and to sector ACLs, and I'll touch on that in a moment.

And some have proposed that the annual catch limit should be a limit, while others think that it should be both a target and a limit, so we've been looking at that as well.

So during the public comment period heard that people really wanted we some flexibility to create sector ACLs and accountability measures to address of fairness among the sectors in a fisher. So we've been considering how stock ACL might а subdivided that way. This could be optional and not required, and, if so, the option of having accountability measures for sector, that these could be defined by the councils or the secretary, and basically just to address the issue of fairness among sectors in a fishery, for example, to avoid punishing

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

all the sectors in a fishery if only one sector was responsible for causing an overage of an annual catch limit.

So given that fishery science and management is imperfect, we wanted to have the quidelines address this uncertainty. So one way that we've considered that scientific uncertainty could be addressed in establishing limits could be to annual catch make estimate of an overfishing limit that uses the best available science, then reduce from that to account for the scientific uncertainty and that would be the acceptable biological catch, and the ABC could be the upper bound of the annual catch limit.

And to address management uncertainty or the degree to which management can control the actual catch to the target catch in a fishery, one way that could be addressed is to treat the NL caps on it as a limit and then establish a management target below that based on the level of management

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

control.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

An example of how that might be done is to look at past performance of a fishery in having an annual -- the actual catch achieve the target catch. So with a simple example who have three different fisheries with three different management approaches, and the first fishery, the actual catch always comes pretty close to achieving the target, so its management controls much more precise and, in such a case like an IFQ fishery perhaps, the target could be that much closer to the limit. Whereas, in the opposite side of the spectrum, a fishery that has a lot of variation in the actual catch achieving the target, you might need to set the target further below the limit to account for that uncertainty.

The MSA does not define accountability measures even, so that's another objective we have for the guidelines.

But according to language in 303(A)(15), it's

pretty clear that the accountability measures are associated with the annual catch limit. And two types of accountability measures have been suggested, one being in-seasons measures that try to prevent the catch from exceeding the limits and another to address overages of the annual catch limit after the fact. these kind of ends could be established to operational factors address not only the leading to the overage, but also any biological issues that have resulted.

developing the quidelines in while faced with several issues resulting, again, from the diversity existing in U.S. fisheries, one issue is how to apply annual catch limits to all stocks. I mentioned that there are two statutory exemptions, one for the annual life cycle species and the other for international stocks. And, in addition, there's some situations that we've discovered annual catch limits may not be operationally feasible suggested or some have even

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

necessary. Such situations include stocks that are very data poor; some stocks in which most catch occurs in state waters; stocks that are minimally impacted by a fishery, for instance, some FMPs include data collection only stocks; stocks that are managed under endangered species acts recovery plans; and aquaculture stocks.

Another issue is that there's a lot of variation in the number of stocks that FMPs Some FMPs only include stocks that include. are the direct object of a fishery, while other FMPs include all species in the And so we've been looking at MSA ecosystem. section 303(A)(2), which requires that FMPs contain description of the fishery, а including the species of fish involved and trying to explore what does it really mean to be involved in the fishery and what would be an appropriate minimum expectation that some stocks would be included in an FMP.

And, obviously, the more stocks

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that are included, the more likely you are going to get some data poor stocks in the FMP, which is a challenge for creating ACLs. But, on the other hand, including more stocks also means the FMP's probably taking a more ecosystem approach.

the bottom line is So t.hat. anticipate the [inaudible] will publish this But even without the NS one revised quidelines in place, the statutory requirements must still be met. So the annual catch limits include and measures to accountability would need to be in place by 2010 for stocks experiencing overfishing and 2011 for all others. And the performance measure in the Act is such that overfishing does not occur. So there's not really a lot of wiggle room there.

There are some general principles to keep in mind at this point. Thresholds, limits, and targets should be based upon the best scientific information available.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Managers should establish a risk policy for scientists to use in recommending threshold limits and targets, and this might be in the form of controls. Incorporating scientific uncertainty in the specification of catch thresholds and limits. Setting catch targets below limits to incorporate management possible, uncertainty. Where prevent exceeding annual catch limits in season, and they are exceeded, to take corrective action immediately or as soon as possible to correct the problem that caused the overage and mitigate any biological harm. And all of this requires that the management feedback much possible to loop is sped up as as increase the response time.

So a couple of other MSRA updates.

As far as the NEPA MSA streamlining, we anticipate that the proposed rule will publish this summer. And with regards to the limited access privileged program provisions, we anticipate that the proposed rule will

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	probably publish this fall. There was a
2	technical memo published in November which
3	focused on the design and use of LAP programs,
4	but the purpose of the guidance that would be
5	coming out this Fall would be to ensure that
6	the standards and requirements in the
7	Magnuson-Stevens Act will be applied
8	consistently nationwide. And examples of
9	issues that might be included in this guidance
10	would be limits on holding privileges,
11	eligibility to participate in LAP programs,
12	excessive shares, regional fishery association
13	plan acceptability, and cost recovery.
14	So with that I'll open it up to
15	some questions.
16	MR. AUGUSTINE: Thank you. Pat
17	Augustine, Mid Atlantic.
18	Jennifer, good presentation. Would
19	you make a note to send a copy of this program
20	to all of the councils?
21	MS. ISE: Sure.
22	MR. AUGUSTINE: Mid Atlantic has

1	already formed an ad hoc committee to address
2	this for our SSC with an assigned set, and
3	we're finding that the data that we've seen so
4	far, this is probably the best package I've
5	ever seen on where we're going,
6	interpretation, and so on. So that's the
7	first thing.
8	And, again, the second question, or
9	the question would be, when will we see any
10	clarification as to what the SSC is actually
11	supposed to be doing from your office, or do
12	we have it, this is it?
13	MS. ISE: Well, that would be in
14	the guidelines. So whenever we get that
15	published, which will hopefully be this
16	summer, there will be some guidance on the
17	role of the SSC.
18	MR. AUGUSTINE: Terrific. Thank
19	you.
20	(Off mic speaking.)
21	UNIDENTIFIED MALE #2: Well, we've
22	already adopted that in our SOP. But the

1	information that she has here, as to
2	establishing ACLs and AFs, I think it's clear
3	here than any document we've seen, and to be
4	able to send this off to all council members
5	via the executive director or chairman of each
6	of those council would be beneficial to the
7	council members.
8	MS. ISE: Just one clarification.
9	This was mostly our most of all these
10	slides were presented at the last CCC meeting
11	I think.
12	UNIDENTIFIED MALE #2: [Inaudible.]
13	MS. ISE: Well, we'll send it
14	again.
15	UNIDENTIFIED MALE #3: This
16	reauthorization saw a lot of new terminology
17	that limits thresholds and targets, and,
18	again, I think your presentation's probably
19	the best that I've seen in kind of describing
20	those. What I'm still a little confused about
21	is which of these terms now correspond to

22

optimum yields?

2 3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. ISE: We're probably thinking that the target would probably be most closely associated with optimum yield I think because the annual catch from its upper bound would be based on the fishing level recommendation of the SSC, and if that were -- as we had it here as one suggestion, it could be the ABC. think that the annual catch limit, depending it sat, or the target could be on where closely associated with the optimum yield.

> UNIDENTIFIED MALE #3: Thank you.

Sean McKeon. MR. McKEON: I wasn't thinking about that, but I want to follow up with what the gentleman just said. With respect to optimum yield and then settings, it almost like there's an indication seems they're trying to set some sort of a buffer below that, and I wonder if that's problematic with national standard one. If you have to achieve optimum yields, how then do you have the buffer that you're going to stop that? just wondering if there's any problems

1	with that national standard.
2	MS. ISE: Well, no, because optimum
3	yield, you're supposed to prevent overfishing
4	anyway. So I mean I don't the buffer is
5	one. That would be up to the scientists and
6	the councils or the secretary or HMS. So I
7	don't see that it would be in conflict at all
8	with optimum yield.
9	MR. McKEON: Okay. I have a couple
10	other questions with respect to ACLs and the
11	exceptions for data poor. How does it square
12	with best available?
13	MS. ISE: There is not an exception
14	for data poor.
15	MR. McKEON: All right. Let me go
16	to what you had written here.
17	MS. ISE: I think what we're trying
18	to do in that slide where it talks about the
19	data poor stock?
20	MR. McKEON: Yes.
21	MS. ISE: It just an issue that
22	we've been wrestling with and that we've

gotten lot of public comment and different viewpoints. So that's this all We're proposing this means. not in presentation that there would be an exemption for data poor stocks.

MR. McKEON: That kind of caught my eye because I think most of us would agree a lot of them are data poor that we have to do.

I think there's a lot of interest in my industry with taking a very long, hard look at separating the sectors in a lot of these fisheries. I think it would achieve a with lot of your goals respect to accountability, we've been having and discussions kind of internally and around with some of my colleagues and we certainly think that that's something that should be taken a good hard look at.

The LAP thing, I was on that South Atlantic advisory panel, whatever they call it, down there in LAPs, and the last meeting we had where they summed up the interest was

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

pretty much their -- at this time is almost zero interest by the industry until a whole bunch of problems are worked out with those They've not been able programs. to they're going anybody really how to effectively, where they've worked effectively. The range in the South Atlantic, the states are so different. I think it was the chairman of the South Atlantic said that he heard in public comment and what they received almost zero support for that, and I think that's important to consider.

But I do think there's a lot of interest, and I just repeat it for emphasis, on separating the sectors. I think like summer flounder and I think that's kind of a poster child for one sector driving the engine and another sector that is held accountable having to suffer some of those consequences. So there is some strong interest in that.

MS. ISE: Thanks.

(Off mic speaking.)

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. ISE: Well, the LAP guidelines, again, the LAP provisions are optional. So if the council doesn't want to implement any LAPs, that's totally fine.

Yes. Well, thank you.

MS. MILLER: This is Shana Miller. For the international exemption, I'm thinking about in the Pacific where you have highly species managed by council migratory the versus an HMS division like in the Atlantic, and for some of those species that aren't over fished, but U.S. scientists do not assess the stocks, they're assessed by international bodies, but domestically we don't have catch limits and internationally with any specific no catch limits. So how would that fall under this 2011 guidelines or deadline, or are those stocks of highly migratory specific stocks they would just be exempt and not included?

MS. ISE: We're still working on the international exemption language trying to look through it and see if the -- see how it

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would apply. So I can't really comment on if they will apply. But there is a statutory exemption for stocks that are managed under an international agreement. So I guess that's about all I can say right now. Unless Alan wants to say anything else.

MR. FISHER: Myron Fisher. On the new guidance requirements, if the SSC gives you an ABC range rather than a point estimate, if it falls in a range, where does the ACL fall? Does it have to be below the midpoint, or can it be at the edge of the envelope at the edge of the range? And, secondly, is the ACL more or less replacing the tack in this case?

MS. ISE: For all of this, like I said, these are just things that we've considered and so I can't give you any sort of definitive answer. I think as far as a range, that would be something that the council would need to talk about with their SSC. If they didn't want a range, then, you know, they

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	would have to establish some sort of protocol
2	with the SSC about how the recommendation
3	what form the recommendation would come in.
4	So I can't really speak to that right now.
5	And then I'm sorry I forgot the
6	second question.
7	MR. FISHER: Is the ACL more or
8	less becoming a tack or at least a quota for
9	that sector?
10	MS. ISE: Again, these are just
11	things that we're thinking about, and there
12	will most likely be a lot of flexibility for
13	the councils to decide how to treat the ACLs.
14	So I can't really answer yes or no.
15	MR. FISHER: And maybe it wasn't a
16	question. Maybe it was something to go back
17	and think about.
18	MS. ISE: Okay.
19	MR. FISHER: And I've got one last
20	issue. It's very minor, but it's on the slide
21	that's up there. You're not proposing a catch
22	limit on aquaculture ventures. I think he'd

1	want to harvest every fish he has in the cage.
2	I don't think you want to tell him what his
3	ACL would be on aquaculture stocks. I didn't
4	know if you meant the wild stock or the raised
5	stock in the cage.
6	MS. ISE: Well, it's just exactly
7	like you described. Those are just the issues
8	that we're considering, like how would the
9	guidelines address that kind of an issue.
10	MR. STONE: Dick Stone at MMA. I
11	want to compliment you on putting together a
12	good, helpful document.
13	MS. ISE: Thank you.
14	MR. STONE: I'm just a little
15	concerned that there's not enough emphasis on
16	the improved fisheries data aspect. There are
17	a number of things that are going on that I
18	think could be helped by putting a little more
19	emphasis on that, ACCSP, MRIP, in other words,
20	other efforts that are ongoing I think need to

provide the SSCs and HMS and other with the

be encouraged and strengthened because

21

22

to

data that they need to do some of this I think is extremely important and something that can't be over emphasized. Thank you.

MS. ISE: Well, first, the recreational data improvement, we're definitely talking with the folks that are doing that. They know that this is going to be very critical for annual catch limits. So we're talking.

MR. GERENCER: Bill Gerencer. First of all, that was a great presentation. It was very clear. Second thing is that data poor is an issue, but I think even bigger is data slow. We always seem to be managing in the blind or with obsolete data and I don't think that's a very effective way to manage. It just keeps being sort of like standard operating procedure and that really needs to be addressed.

And then the third thing is optimum yields. Most plans that I've been associated with seem bereft of any or unable to address

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

achieving optimum yields, and our newest terminology, annual catch limits, has quickly gotten the name in New England of always catch less. You know we're managing a fishery here and so at some point, you know, we need fish stock to come back. Swordfish is a great case in point where we seem unable to even really make any strides at achieving optimum yield there to the point where we're going to lose swordfish.

So I think without that those things, as good fisheries managers, we not only have to manage the fish, we have to manage the fisheries. Thank you.

MS. ISE: Well, as far as the data slow issue, we have definitely been thinking about that as well, and I think that was in one of the slides here about the monitoring capability for fishery. That's one thing we know has been an issue in some fisheries is having the data coming out once the season is over. So obviously the preference is to have

in-season data where possible and the science side of the house is looking at how to improve systems in order to fishery data support annual catch limits and improve in-season So we're definitely looking at that measures. and having been thinking about that.

I guess that's all I'll say.

MS. MERRITT: Thank you. Rita Merritt, South Atlantic Fishery Council. A couple of things I want to comment on, and thank you, Jennifer, particularly for bringing up the fact that past performance is important in this scenario of developing annual catch limits.

The South Atlantic Council has been wrestling with a couple of things, and Sean brought up the one on limited access program, and the biggest challenges there were you try to get by in of fishermen to have a program when there are so many uncertainties as you've mentioned, and, particularly, how do you define fair and equitable. Everybody has a

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	different opinion of what that is and all of
2	that ties into the accountability measures
3	trying to figure out just how do we get this
4	accountability.
5	And I do think that this new
6	development of the MRIP, and I can't remember
7	the entire definition of what MRIP is, but
8	it's the, what, Marine Recreational
9	UNIDENTIFIED MALE #4: Marine
10	Recreational Information Program.
11	MS. MERRITT: Okay, thank you.
12	Anyway, the MRIP program. If I'm not
13	mistaken, they're supposed to have that
14	developed the beginning of '09, but we're
15	really not going to see anything coming out of
16	that for several years is the way I see it and
17	I just don't know how that's going to help us
18	now to accomplish all of these lofty goals
19	that are coming out of MSA.
20	I guess the other thing is to get
21	some definition out there first so that we

know what it is we're trying to accomplish

1	here and I appreciate it. Thank you.
2	MS. ISE: Thank you. Well, we
3	totally understand the issue of having the
4	improved data. You know, that's not going to
5	happen by 2010. I mean like everything I
6	guess it will be an integrative process and
7	hopefully progress as the years go on, but we
8	have to do what we can in the meantime with
9	what we have.
10	MR. HEMILRIGHT: [Inaudible.]
11	Dewey Hemilright. These annual catch
12	landings, is this just for the commercial or
13	is it recreational also?
14	MS. ISE: It's for both. It's for a
15	fishery, for stock, yes.
16	MR. WHITAKER: Rom Whitaker,
17	Hatteras Charter Boat. Just to touch on what
18	Bill said, and you explained a little bit, but
19	where we go to monitor the capacity, it seems
20	like that's always been a problem with us and
21	we've been talking about MRVs for year. But I
22	would like to see more detail on how they're

going to the monitoring capacity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. ISE: Do you mean for the recreational only?

MR. WHITAKER: Yes, recreational.

MS. ISE: Well, I don't know if you have anybody coming to talk about that. Do you? So maybe Margo could get somebody to come in and talk to you more about that, how they're going to improve that. I can't speak to it.

Ron Coddington. MR. CODDINGTON: Speeding up the process is one of the most important things you can do. One of the things we're talking about is the Marine We've been Recreational Information Program. ready for that study in Florida since the first of the year. The e-mail I just got says there maybe funds May 1<sup>st</sup>. The funds were allocated last year. I think they were in the previous fiscal year budget and they're just now maybe ready to trickle down to the State of Florida for the pilot program there.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	months seems like a long time to move funds.
2	I realize we're talking about the federal
3	government, but anything we do to speed up
4	those programs is going to help us especially
5	with the time tables you're working against.
6	MS. ISE: Right. Well, as far as
7	budget issues, I will let Alan address that.
8	MR. RISENHOOVER: [Inaudible.]
9	MR. CODDINGTON: Just one final
10	comment. I would normally save this for an
11	outreach part of the agency, but I didn't see
12	one on here. It'd be really helpful if we
13	could have these presentations in electronic
14	copies on some part of the HMS website. I
15	don't know if that's possible or not. But
16	these hard copies are great, but the fact that
17	we could go and access them when we want would
18	be really a nice feature.
19	MS. ISE: Or maybe we could put
20	them on the MSA implementation update website,
21	too. Alan wants to say something.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. RISENHOOVER: [Inaudible.]

1 MS. ISE: Yes, that's up there. 2 MR. RISENHOOVER: [Inaudible.] CODDINGTON: 3 MR. Okay, great. Thanks a lot. Again, thank you very much. 4 MS. ISE: Just to follow up, Brad 5 6 has said that Ron intends to be here tomorrow, 7 so tomorrow morning. So I think we could ask 8 him for an update on some of the MRIP activities at the same time. So we'll try and 9 10 make that happen. MR. McHALE: Good morning. We just 11 to give you a quick update 12 13 Pelagic Longline Research that we've been doing, well as just an update 14 as 15 fishery in general. So we have a few slides here that we'd like to present to you. 16 As many of you know who are on the 17 HMSAP and for some of the new members you may 18 19 not know, just a little bit of background information on the exempted fishing permit 20 The Florida east coast and that we issued. 21

areas have been closed to

22

Charleston bump

vessels fishing with pelagic longline gears since 2001. Since that time we haven't been able to collect any information from pelagic longline vessels in the closed areas.

There have fairly been some significant changes in the fishery since that time. The swordfish fishery has changed due to the closures going into effect, as well as other facts, and the swordfish stock at this point is nearly rebuilt at 0.99 bmsy. fairly significant change in there the fishery.

In addition to that, there have been some new gear requirements that went into effect in 2004 that I'm sure all of you are aware of. Circle hook requirements, as well handling and release equipment, as has released entangled sea turtles and endangered species, as well as workshop that are required for all pelagic longline vessel owners and operators.

The objectives of the research were

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to collective baseline pelagic longline fishery data from portions of the east Florida coast and Charleston bump closed areas. We use the term east Florida coast to distinguish that from the FEC, which is the statistical reporting area that's used for the pelagic longline fishery, which is larger.

So we wanted to collect baseline information under current fishery conditions, those being the ones Ι described previous slide, the circle hook new requirements being in effect and the changed status of the swordfish stock as a whole. also wanted to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing bycatch reduction measures, again, the circle hooks and equipment that requiring all pelagic longline we're on We also needed to collect data vessels. necessary to examine the effectiveness of the closures existing area to meet conservation and harvesting goals.

The pelagic longline research

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

exempted fishing permit notices that published came out in November. That was the draft environmental assessment that we published and took public comment on. And published final then а environmental assessment on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, as well our exempted fishing permit to conduct the authorized activities.

We received a number of comments on the draft. We responded to those comments in the final EA. Some of the things that we took into account that we have looked at in the draft EA, for instance, the draft EAlargely based on j-hook data from 1995 through 2000. Of course, we didn't have any information from 2000 forward, but did include whatever circle hook information we had from the pelagic observer program from 2004 through 2005 in the mid Atlantic and the Florida east coast statistical reporting area. So we did have some limited circle hook information since that requirement went into

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

effect, and we incorporated that data and included some additional analysis using that

circle hook information in the final EA.

authorized. Three vessels, with only two operating at any given time and one dedicated backup vessel, are currently authorized to make 289 sets consisting of 5 18/0 non-offset circle hooks each. So we're splitting the sets equally between the open and closed areas. One half of the sets will be made inside the closed areas, one half outside the closed areas.

The Charleston bump closure being in effect for only three months out of the year, February, March and April. Those were the time periods that we considered for that area of the east Florida coast closures. Obviously closed year round, so we took into account data for the year round closure.

In addition, we have 100 percent observer coverage requirements throughout the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

duration of the experiment and the experiment will last one year. I think they made some of their first sets in February.

Here you can see the areas that are authorized for the research to take place in hashed areas off the Florida east coast, and also in the Charleston bump. The Charleston bump area cut off is approximately the 200 meter line, which you can see there in dashed form. And then in the Florida east coast, it's roughly east of 79, 40.

We intentionally selected the areas minimize potential gear conflicts. to Particularly off of Florida, we wanted to stay away from the Gulf stream area, so seaward of that where we anticipated recreational vessels be. t.o We also intentionally located that area away from the 200 meter drop off because that is where most of the bycatch has historically occurred at least prior to the closure going into effect. Both of those were intended to minimize any

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

potential conflicts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The results to date, and we don't have a lot of information because, as I said, it's ongoing and we've only had a number of trips that have been done so far, so we've got four trips that are completed with the two vessels, 24 sets total with 18/0 non-offset The highest swordfish catch per circle hooks. far unit effort thus has in been the Charleston bump. And if you go back and look at the previous slide, that following the 200 that's really contour, not surprising because that is where the swordfish tend to aggregate.

No bluefin tuna have been caught. There have been four white marlin, three blue marlin, and three sailfish caught thus far. The sailfish was released dead. The other, it's an even split between some live and some dead releases. And there have been two sea turtle interactions, one loggerhead and one leatherback, both released alive with no

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

trailing gear. And one of those was in the closed area, one was in the open area.

I apologize for not having more succinct information on the closures in terms of what occurred inside versus outside. We're still getting that information together and will certainly make that available to you when we have it, but at this point we're still compiling that information. So that's what we have on the EFT.

of additional Atlantic In terms pelagic longline take reduction team updates, I'm sure you all are aware that the draft Atlantic PLTR plan, PLTRP, was released in June 2006 and the web page is there for you if you'd like to view that document. Unfortunately, we don't have copies, but if you would like one, we can get one for you. And the proposed rule for the plan is going through internal review right now NIMF. is a meeting that's going to be scheduled this to coincide with the proposed rule summer

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

comment period.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Some other updates. In addition to the PLTRP, we've got a reminder that we sent out regarding live bait prohibition in the Gulf of Mexico. We issued that reminder in early January because we were hearing from enforcement that there were some concerns and seemed to be some just vessels that were not complying with the regulations. So distributed some notices reminding people that they may not fish or deploy PLL gear with live bait obviously. They may not possess live bait on board. And they may not maintain live bait fish in a tank or well, and they also not attach an aeration or set up or circulation device to any tank or well, and they of course went over that yesterday, so we appreciate them covering that.

In terms of upcoming and ongoing activities, we're looking at some of the observer program data and examining catches of sea turtles on different hooks and bait

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	combinations to try and discern some
2	information there in terms of whether higher
3	catches may be occurring on certain bait and
4	hook combos.
5	We're continuing to examine
6	swordfish marketing options. I think we
7	covered that at the last AP meeting. Our
8	division with NOAA fisheries, partnerships and
9	communications has the lead on that. And in
10	addition, we're monitoring swordfish landings
11	and preparing for the ICAP meeting, which will
12	be coming up this year.
13	So that concludes my presentation.
14	If there are any questions, I'd be happy to
15	take those.
16	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE #2: I want to
17	clarify. Did you say you did not receive any
18	information so that you know whether any of
19	the sets of the four trips were inside or
20	outside? I mean there were only four trips.
21	MR. McHALE: No, they've been

rather evenly split between sets inside and

outside of the closed areas, not exactly even, but fairly close.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE #2: Okay. And

on the bycatch of marlin, you said you noted one sailfish was dead. But then when you referenced the marlin, you said well it was fairly evenly split. Why didn't you identify how many marlin were dead?

MR. McHALE: Again, it's because we're getting updates as we speak. I was contacting our researcher, who's lead on the EFP, and he's e-mailed me some information in the last day or two. So I don't have that breakdown, but I can get it for you. I just haven't had a chance to work it up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE #2: And are the condition of the bycatch species that are severely over fished, is the condition of the fish noted upon release, and are there any PSAT tags put on these to further document the condition of the release bycatch?

MR. McHALE: They're not attaching

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

any PSAT tags. However, they are recording the condition of the fish using the standard pelagic observer program methodology of documenting that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE #2: Will you be making this additional information available within a week or two, or how soon can we expect it on the bycatch?

MR. McHALE: Yes, I think we should have that within a week.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE #2: Thank you.

MR. CODDINGTON: Yes, Coddington. One question I have is with the It looks like we're going to number of sets. have a hard time getting to the number of sets based on the monthly sets we've been doing so far and I realize the program has a ramp up So one question would be, and you can issue. the end here, is will you be answer at increasing the sets later on to try to get to that target number of sets which may create issues with your spacial and temporal

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

aspects of the program? That's one question.

The other one is a comment and I other people at the table are know some probably going to have more detailed comments But on all these issues I see coming up, I keep seeing -- whether we're talking about sharks, live bait in the Gulf, or this, is observer coverage, observer coverage, observer coverage. Do you have enough observers? Because there seems to be some indication that some of these sets were not made by these two vessels because there aren't observers available and there may even be a boat sitting at the dock now because of an observer, or something like that. And I see the observer program getting strained.

MR. McHALE: Yes, observer coverage has been a challenge and it has curtailed some of the activity. Obviously, we need enough trained observers on board, so we're relying on those primarily. But we've had some of the research staff that are going through the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

observer training to be qualified to do the observer coverage as well. So that has been a concern. It has limited some of the sets.

In terms of whether we need to keep on track with the total number sets, there's a lot that's going to go into that. One's going to be analysis of the data, and if we're seeing statistically significant differences or not, that could play a factor in terms of whether we need to conduct those additional sets or ramp up more sets at the end of the year if we're not on track. So there will be a lot that goes into play with that. We'll have to work with the science centers to determine what the appropriate number sets would be to conduct.

MR. SCHRATWIESER: Jason Schratwieser. Thanks for the update. Appreciate it.

I think it would be informative if it would be possible for us to have a quarterly update as the data come in detailing

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

not only catch of targeted species inside and outside the closed areas, but also bycatch. And I'd also like to see that in reference to what the EFP proposal predicted. I think that would be really informative. Thanks again for the update.

MS. BEIDEMAN: Terri Beideman. With regard to releasing the data, it was a little bit of certainly interest in seeing it, but my concern is with quality control before the stuff gets out there and people start building up a head of steam over something that might be wrong. I had a little bit of experience with that regarding various species over the years. I just kind of caution, it's easy, you know, it's easy to have an error and then it's harder to undo it after that.

My number one point is the standard of comparison when all is said and done and all the sets are made and all the data is collected that the powers that be that analyze this, because that's just to the ground is a

critical key. I mean you know, you see the map, you know, what there is and what there isn't. It isn't like you can go set a pelagic longline here in the Barnegat Bay and catch swordfish. So just because you have some open area doesn't mean that you have a fishing ground.

The standard of comparison has to be pre-closure percentages, not what it used to be last year when it was totally closed because, of course, you're going to have an I mean no brainer. You have to increase. look at what it was before, percentages. can see the interest in the bycatch from various sectors and that's good, but you have to take a look at what it was and how much is left, not how much it's increased from when it was totally closed, because, of course, that's going to be the different. So that's my number two caution.

And I believe if you check the record, you will see that that's been raised

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 at least by me a whole load of times. 2 please, don't raise the bar higher than it needs to be. We need access to these grounds 3 or we're going to lose the fishery. You know, 4 5 once they're gone, they're gone. 6 And guess that's it for now. Ι 7 Thanks. MR. HEMILRIGHT: Dewey Hemilright. 8 I have just a couple of questions here. One, 9 10 on your second page of your presentation, the Charleston Bump is closed for four months of 11 It's not closed year round. the year. 12 13 just up there it kind of looks like it's --Okay. I apologize for 14 MR. McHALE: that. 15 MR. HEMILRIGHT: Number two thing 16 is why did they only choose 18/0 non-offset 17 circle hooks? Because especially when you're 18 19 allowed to fish three different types hooks, a straight 16, a offset 18, and an 20 straight 18. Why that particular 21

Because I personally fish with a straight 16,

which is a smaller hook.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And the third thing is what's the total days at sea of these vessels? Meaning even though they only made 12 set, they might have been out there for -- or 24 sets, they might have been out there 40 days because of weather. And maybe if it appears that we're not getting enough sets in, we need more vessels to get the amount of sets in, they get it done. Because a lot of times, you know, they might not fish two or three days because of the weather and they couldn't go And these fisheries are based on back in. what they catch is how they're getting paid I believe. They're not being subsidized, are they?

So I mean I was wondering what the total amount of days at sea when they leave the dock to dock? Because when we filed our logbooks, you know, you told how many days you're going. So just because you made 24 sets, you could have been going 40 days.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. McHALE: Yes. I don't know the
2	total number of days at sea thus far. We can
3	get that information and that's an important
4	consideration, obviously. So that's something
5	we'll look into.
6	In terms of the 18/0 non-offset
7	circle hooks, that was primarily intended for
8	the conservation benefits because they are
9	much greater with that type of circle hook and
10	the fact that it's non-offset. So we wanted
11	to minimize the potential for any bycatch,
12	particularly of sea turtles in the closed
13	area. That was the intent.
14	MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well, I just don't
15	want all of a sudden to come up here in a year
16	and the next thing I know I've got to go to
17	18/0 circle hooks. And the conservation
18	benefit, where was this studied at, just in
19	the Grand Banks?
20	MR. McHALE: Correct.
21	MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well, what works
22	in the Grand Banks sometimes might not work

off North Carolina or South Carolina.

MR. McHALE: Point taken.

MS. ISE: One other quick note, part of the reason to limit the hook, also, was to keep the number of variables down. So the more variables you have, the more sets you need. So you have any kind of statistical analysis that shows anything at the end. So wanting, also, to limit that at least in this pilot stage.

MR. MONTELLA: Vince Montella. It appears there was some poor planning involved here in regard to observers. I mean Dave Caresetter, who was the primary researcher in this thing, is currently in observer school after the EFP has already began. That doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

There's been four trips made. I know at least one of those trips the vessel started inside, in the closed zone, ended up fishing outside because of poor fishing. I don't know how you make comparisons. It seems

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

to me you would have to have a vessel inside and outside during the same time period in order to do comparisons of what's being caught on each side. Obviously, I mean, a cold front comes through and shuts them off on a particular night.

And getting back to the observers, one of the vessels in this experiment has made one trip inside with an observer, the second Now he informed me on Monday that he's doing three trips now with requests of an observer and he still doesn't have it. leaving today without an observer again. Vince Pyle seems to get an observer on his boat every time. I don't understand why one boat is getting observers and the other one's But it just seems like the observer not. thing is not quite working out here especially since, you know -- I mean Dave probably has the most experience of any observer we know in the pelagic longline and he's not qualified at the moment to go on those vessels.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	doesn't seem like it was planned out very
2	well.
3	MR. McHALE: Well, in part you're
4	right. We've had problems with that. There
5	have been some additional requirements for
6	observer coverage in the Gulf of Mexico, 100
7	percent beginning in March. So there is a lot
8	of strain on the observer program. I have to
9	admit that. And we're trying to account for
10	it by having additional people take the
11	training and trying to get that observer
12	coverage that we need.
13	MR. MONTELLA: How many observers
14	are in the Gulf at the moment?
15	MR. McHALE: I don't know how many.
16	MR. MONTELLA: Ten, 20, 100? I
17	mean we have an EFP. I mean would think an
18	EFP would take priority over, you know I
19	mean we can't spare one observer to continue
20	with this EFP? And if it doesn't, are you
21	going to prolong it past year if the vessels
	l <b>l</b>

don't get the sets?

1	MR. McHALE: That's something we'd
2	have to think about at the end of the year.
3	MR. MONTELLA: It seems to me that
4	the blue water proposal was better with 13
5	vessels and it would have more coverage and it
6	would have actually given us a better idea of
7	what's happening. Nothing against your
8	attempt to do it here with two, because I know
9	my good friends here had a lot to say about
10	the 13. But it just seems like an honest
11	effort would have been a better you know,
12	give us more detail.
13	MR. McHALE: Well, I know we did
14	allocate additional funding for the observer
15	program, and, like I said, it's just been
16	they have a lot of responsibilities right now.
17	So this is just another one that's been added
18	to their list.
19	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
20	MR. McHALE: We're trying.
21	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
22	MR. RUAIS: Thank you. Rich Ruais.

I'm qlad to see that there's lot interest in the ongoing research that's here today and it seems as though there's even a little disappointment that the data is not coming in fast enough, and I think Vince had the answer to that. Ιf you would have accepted the blue water proposal and we had 13 boats, you'd have a whole lot more data to be reviewing right now. So, anyways, that's one point.

When Vince makes the point about one of the boats, the Christian Lee, has gone out three times or four times now without an observer, I want everybody to understand he's not going into the closed area. He's going buoy fishing. He's not participating in the research at that time.

The observers has been a problem. There's been contract delays, as Margo knows only too well. And the training of Jay's grad students took a little longer. Dave's own training was complicated by the fact that his

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

wife was having a baby and that kind of took a little precedence in his life. Although we discouraged it, but it just didn't work out very well. He insisted and she insisted it was going to go forward.

But, anyways, I want to emphasize what Terri said. When all the data is finally in, the comparison is the POP data pre-1999. we're trying to show is that mandatory circle hooks and safe handling release practices, that you can clean up the fishery from what it once was when you didn't have those management alternatives and tools in front of you. Now you have them. So the comparison is what your bycatch rates were like in that five year period pre-1999, not for white marlin to date.

And I think there's some confusion here. The observers, in terms of defining the condition, when you actually get the log report, you will see the descriptions of -- it is required that the observer give his best

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

view of injuries sustained, or likelihood of survival, or damage done and there'll be some information coming on that.

The other point, the point, Chris, that I was going to ask you is the only thing you left off here in your presentation was Charlie Bergman's Pascagoula lab research on weak hook in the Gulf of Mexico which critical in our mind, and we put a lot of effort into making sure that takes place. in case some of you aren't familiar about that, the NMPS is again conducting its own experiment using a couple of commercial boats alternating weak hook with а а regular, standardized hook to try to find the perfect hook, if you will, that will allow the capture and retention of the largest yellowfin tuna, but allow giant bluefin tuna on the spawning grounds to just break away.

And he's doing ground choosing information. It's an incredible piece of research that he's doing. He's actually

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	taking dead bluefin off of some of the boats
2	and setting them out and hauling them back to
3	prove the fish are not being lost in the
4	haulback procedure, but, in fact, the fish are
5	actually straightening out the hook and
6	getting off while they're alive. So they
7	won't be subject to that criticism that, you
8	know, it wasn't the weak hook, it was that
9	there is a haul back. It fell off during the
10	haul back. So that research we see as being
11	very critical and deserving as much attention
12	as what we're doing in the Charleston bump
13	area as well.
14	I think that's it. Thank you.

MR. WHITAKER: Rom Whitaker, Hatteras Charter Boats. Just as an advisory panel member to help advise, I think it's critical that we not only hear the bycatch, but the targeted species and have it available ASAP. Thank you.

MR. AUGUSTINE: Thank you. Pat Augustine. Has anyone given a thought to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

investing some money in realtime video as opposed to the observer program? It just seems to me what we're having that observer do is to determine the critical nature of these animals, whether they're alive, dead, or what status they are.

And I think like the vessel monitoring system that was brought to the table, and I think an advisory panel back in New Orleans in about 1997, we talked about why not use existing tracking gear that's out there and apply it to the commercial fishing fleet. Well, it's now ten or 12 years later and we do have a vessel monitoring system.

But I think realtime video with a satellite communications capabilities, now it's time to look at this other method for observer coverage. And there's no question as quotas get squeezed and the commercial vessels get squeezed and the numbers that are going to be out there fishing, as well as recreational, we need something that will give us a real

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

picture.

And there's just not enough observers, and there's not ever going to be enough observers. So if we want accuracy, we want honesty, what better way than to look at a monitor and say this is what is. So I think you should consider that in the future, or near future if you can.

MR. ROGERS: I do know there are a couple of pilot projects going on using that technology. So something to look into.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Maybe with the critical shortage of observers, maybe we should look at some of the court-required community service and just draft them into observer training immediately and put them on boats to bump up our crop.

But back to what Terri and Rich both -- back to some of the points they raised. Certainly assessing the data and making sure before you release it that it's all been given good scrutiny, certainly once

it comes out, we'll have Dr. Goodyear to go over it as well.

But to Terri's point and Rich's on bycatch, certainly the the comparison of composition of the bycatch species, as well as the targeted species in this case, both have changed. Swordfish having increased significantly more so. White marlin, which we just went through an ESA review, while their stocks have come up, they're not great. the point is that the composition of the bycatch species in numbers is higher now as are the targeted species. So I would defer to a scientist in looking at, in order to have a fair comparison. Since the composition of what you're trolling for or setting for and bycatch has also changed, doesn't there have to be also comparison today, not just pre-1999? But, again, I'll defer to a scientist It seems like there has to be some comparison today as well as to the past.

Moving to the Gulf with what Rich

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

brought up on the weak hook or breakaway
research, is there consideration, are you also
documenting the marlin bycatch? Certainly the
marlin bycatch, as I said repeatedly, is
higher in the Gulf of Mexico by U.S. vessels
over anywhere else they fish. And so while
both of these species, blue and white marlin,
are seriously or severely over fished, is
there documentation being done on the bycatch
species and is there any consideration on
breakaway to reduce the post-release mortality
on those species?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: You I that these vessels know know are out fishing, and so I'm presuming they're filling out logbooks at least, if not other things for the study. I don't know the details of what is being collected on that for some of the other species. Guillermo, do you have a sense of that?

MR. DIAZ: [Inaudible.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Certainly. Do they document in the observer 2 or the captain's logbook the condition of the bycatch species? 3 MR. DIAZ: [Inaudible.] 4 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: 5 Okay. 6 Good. Thank you. MR. MONTELLA: Going back to what 7 Terri has said. I think the comparisons are 8 I know that this experiment is 9 important. 10 multisolvent as far as bycatch is concerned. What's being caught inside and what's being 11 caught outside, obviously, is important, but 12 13 you need to have a baseline that's going to show that the improvements 14 in bycatch 15 reduction are effective, and I think that's 16 what this experiment is really about. In regard to that, you need to look 17 at the sea turtles. I mean post extruding 18 19 devices in the Gulf, the shrimpers, in the last four years I've heard of more sea turtles 20

-- I talk to guys every day. From the Grand

Banks to the Gulf of Mexico, there's more sea

21

I think that needs to be factored into what's being caught now and what was being caught. I don't know who's keeping track of the sea turtles, or what you have in your logbook, or how accurate from your test, but, you know, the fact is that they're seeing them everywhere.

Grand Banks Ι mean the up on there's sea turtles everywhere. In the Gulf of Mexico, out front here, we go out for a day here, live bait and sail fish, we see a half a dozen of them. They're everywhere. So that really needs to be factored into the fact how many are being caught in comparison to what was caught before.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: To Vince's comment, I was going to mention that I was reading a scientist who noted, who in response to a question I asked of her about captain's reports, that as Vince says they're seeing a lot more sea turtles, and the answer was that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that was fully expected in recovering stocks.

You're going to interact with them more when
the actions to protect them are working.

To Alan's comments, Ι agree entirely about there's got to be a look at current day review of the level of marlin catch, not just a comparison with what it was And, you know, the concerns over before. white marlin, you know, we all dodged a bullet on that one, but also remind you there'd be 500 more white marlin in the water today if the tournaments had gone to a circle hook and not waiting an extra year as well. So we can all take a little blame for that.

terms of the Gulf research In that's going on right now, the vessels, you want to keep in mind, are independent -- are hired by the Agency. They're independent contractors at the Agency direction. The Agency directs what's going on. And I know typically that that when happens, scientists that involved want maximum are

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

information flowing because research dollars are very limited, very hard to get a hold of, observers are very hard to get a hold of. I can't believe that you wouldn't see the bycatch information on blue marlin that might be taking place during that research.

Although, as the good doctor points out, the experiment wasn't designed to test the breakaway strength that would be necessary for the blue marlin. That's another experiment. Maybe the foundation can provide some funding for that one. We'll do a joint research.

MILLER: MS. Just one word of caution. Dana Miller. Just word of one caution on the breakaway hook study. I think that definitely has potential and a lot of us in the room are interested in the results of that study. But just because a bluefin tuna would break away that hook and get tagging and fisheries data, we know bluefin are physiologically stressed in the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Gulf of Mexico because of the warm temperatures. So whatever energy that's exerted to break away that hook, you know, there could be post-release mortality there we can't ignore. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. I kind of waited to be last because some of what I have does not have to do with the research portion.

But one comment I do have on the live bait prohibition in the Gulf, and you said notices were resent out early this year, you may be doing so already, but you have to remember that the majority of these fishermen are of the Asian descent and hopefully you sent it in their native language because most of them don't speak English.

And I know it's difficult, but from Louisiana, we've had to notify quite a few of the historic fishermen in French what was going on because they were not English-speaking either. So I hope that's taken and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

consider that, and, obviously, looking at the names, it should be easy to detect.

The other issue I have is just to give some information to you. I was going to do this tomorrow at the tuna update and that's why I sort of waited to be last given my comment because this takes a few minutes.

It has to do with a possible, and I'm going to use the word possible, new and uprise in fish rate. And in the Gulf where the fishermen historically fish for multiple species, being shut down on red snapper and shut down on grouper and shut down on many other fish, a shutdown on shark this year, they have to go find some other methods of paying their mortgages, and HMS species is there.

It's ingenious what's been happening by just a very few boats, and I wouldn't mention it until this year with the high price of fuel and people needing to make money, that maybe it's going to explode, and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

maybe it won't. Maybe the couple of boats doing it is going to just let it die. I don't know if this is a gear type.

But what they're doing is taking, they meaning a few commercial boats, we're blessed with a lot of deep water oil rigs. Some of them in 3,000 to 5,000 foot of water. And on the up-current side you can pretty much count on a school of yellow fin. The distance might vary day by day depending on the current, but they'll be there. Taking small torpedo floats with a small amount of line, 50 to 100 foot of line, circle hook and a live bait, and deploying half a dozen to a dozen of these well up current of a school of tuna, and just letting the current pull them through the school and through the platform and picking them on the down-current side.

And it sounds real ingenious and I don't think there's anything illegal about it because it's not a long line. The only problem that I've heard commercial fishermen

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

talk about it when they hook a marlin, and that's what the live bait prohibition's about, they don't go chase after a couple dollars floats and a 59-cent, 49-cent hook, they just let the marlin jump over the horizon, don't chase after him because they got attend to bobbing buoys trying to hook that bandit to it to bring them in and there's no attempt to even release the billfish alive.

Now, it's not being done on a wide scale, but I just wanted to mention it is being done, and from what I understand, it's nothing illegal about it. But the bycatch issue is almost impossible to solve because once they have buoys going in every direction, they can't keep track of them. I thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: With all due respect to Shana, I don't know how many bluefin tunas she's pulled on, there are plenty of smart people in this room. I view my contribution here as somebody with hands on. And I didn't know about Charlie, you

1 know, his hook test, weak hooks, or whatever. 2 A bluefin tuna is not going to break off in half an hour. He's going to pull 3 -- his initial run is going to break that 4 That's when he's got the most 5 hook. Okay? 6 power, the most energy. It's not going to be 7 something where he's going to hang on a weak hook for 30 minutes and then break the hook. 8 I mean I've pulled on them. 9 10 pulled on lots of them. If a weak hook's going to break, it's going to break on the 11 initial run. 12 So let's take a 15, 20 13 MARGO: minute break. We're going to come back to the 14 15 presentation on the tuna longline permit 16 renewal proposed rule about 10:30, and then after into the permit 17 that move reform presentation right before lunch. 18 19 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter took a break and went off the record at 10:15 20 a.m. and back on the record at 10:30 a.m.) 21

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:

22

This

presentation is a proposed rule for the renewal of Atlantic tuna longline limited access permits, or ATLPs, and Atlantic shark identification workshop attendance requirements. So it's really two topics and the presentation is going to be divided into those two topics.

The proposed rule published last Friday, we're going to be holding hearings the first week in May. The comment period on this proposed rule closes May 12<sup>th</sup>. We anticipate publishing a final rule in June, and the regulations will ultimately become effective in July.

Before I get into it in any great detail, I just want to emphasize that both of these topics concern regulatory changes to address technical or operational constraints.

Both of these topics are anticipated to result in some economic benefits to the affected entities, and we only anticipate minor ecological impacts for both of these.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

of Atlantic tuna longline permits. This proposed rule is a followup to the swordfish revitalization final rule that was published last summer. As you'll recall, that final rule modified vessel upgrading restrictions for vessels concurrently issued three limited access permits.

That would be swordfish permits, swordfish directed or incidental permits, shark directed or incidental permits, and an Atlantic tuna's longline permit. Those are the three permits oftentimes we refer to them as the pelagic longline trifecta.

During implementation, NMPS found inconsistencies between the swordfish and shark permits and the Atlantic tuna longline permit, which were primarily due to the differences in the permitting system used to administer and issue these permits. Again, the modified vessel upgrading regulations were allowed for vessels that were concurrently

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

issue or eligible to renew the swordfish, shark and Atlantic tuna's longline permit on August 6, 2007.

And it was fairly straightforward determining which vessels were issued or eligible to renew their swordfish and shark permits. However, it was a little bit more difficult to make that determination regarding the Atlantic tuna's longline permit.

So I want to now explain some of the differences between the way that the swordfish and shark permits are issued and the way the Atlantic tuna's longline permit is issued.

Start with the swordfish and shark permits. Those permits are issued out of the southeast regional office permit office. So there's an actual office dedicated to issuing and administering these permits. NMPS mails paper renewal applications to permit holders and a lot of the information is already preprinted on that application.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

swordfish and shark permits may be held in
no-vess ID status. Say, for example, that
would be when a permit holder sells a vessel
but wishes to retain that permit. They can
put that permit in no-vess ID status and then

they can renew that permit annually so there's

a clear way to indicate that that permit has

One of the key differences is that

7

1

9

been retained.

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Another very important component of swordfish and shark permits is that those permits remain -- the permit number remains unchanged through time, even if the permit is Say, for example, a swordfish transferred. directed permit might have the number FSD3, and then if that permit is bought transferred to another vessel, that permit number stays the same, FSD3. So those are some of the components of swordfish and shark permits.

Now, I'd like to explain some of the differences between the Atlantic tuna's

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

longline permit. That permit is administered online using www.hmspermits.gov. A general permit renewal reminder letter is mailed. Basically, it's a copied version just to remind people that they need to renew their tuna permits.

No-vess ID status is not available. The tuna longline permit must be linked to a vessel, otherwise, it cannot be issued. And that's a component of the computer program that's used to issue it.

Also, the tuna longline permit does not have a unique number associated with it that remains unchanged through transfer. The permit remains linked to the vessel's Coast Guard documentation number or the state registration number. In fact, because of that, when the permit is transferred, permit number changes.

So all of this results in the fact that ownership of the tuna longline permit can be much more difficult to track through time

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

upon permit transfer or upon changes in vessel ownership.

This is the regulation that we're speaking to modify slightly in this proposed rule. Currently, it reads: Only persons holding a non-expired limited access permit in the preceding year are eligible to renew a limited access permit. So, basically, that means if you didn't have a permit last year, you can't be issued one this year.

The constraints associated with a tuna longline permit were not really fully recognized until this past September, again, when we were determining which vessels were eligible for the revised vessel upgrading restrictions and which vessels had the three permits. Approximately 40 permit holders that thought they were eligible for the tuna longline permit were notified that it had been expired for more than one year, thus they were not eligible to renew it.

We discovered this really when we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

40

2 However, all of these permit holders rule. have maintained their swordfish and shark 3 4 permits through timely renewal. These longer allowed 5 vessels to retain are no

were implementing the swordfish revitalization

swordfish or tunas captured on longline gear 7 because they must concurrently be issued the

swordfish permit, a shark permit, and a tuna

longline permit. 9

1

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

result of some of these of available differences, the number complimentary tuna longline permits may be insufficient to match the number of available swordfish and shark permits. So we have kind of an imbalance in the number because you're required to possess all three to fish with longline tunas with gear or to retain swordfish other than with a swordfish hand gear permit.

So the objectives of this proposed rule were to amend the HMS regulations to be reflective of the operational more

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

capabilities of our permitting system; also, to ensure that there are adequate number of tuna longline permits available for swordfish and shark permit holders to complete the trifecta.

Ultimately, we're hoping to reinforce recent efforts by the National Marine Fisheries Services to revitalize the swordfish fishery by providing a reasonable opportunity to harvest ICAT recommended quota.

So these are the alternatives:

Alternative (1) is the no action or status quo.

Alternative (2), which is the preferred alternative, would allow for the renewal of tuna longline permits that have been expired for more than one year by the most recent permit holder of record provided that the swordfish and shark permits have been maintained through timely renewal, and that all of the other requirements for permit renewal are met.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

I just want to describe a little bit of the summary of impacts. The preferred alternative would not increase the number of tuna longline permits beyond the number of current swordfish limited access permit holders. Essentially, the swordfish permit would be kind of the driving permit in this.

This is what the proposed regulation would say: Only persons holding non-expired swordfish and shark permits in the preceding year are eligible to renew those Right now it permits. says only persons holding non-expired limited access permits. So basically we're removing the tuna longline permit from current regulation our specifying that it's applicable to swordfish and shark permits.

Again, this rule would not change the requirement to possess swordfish and shark permits in order to obtain a tuna longline permit, and it would also retain the characteristic where it requires the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

possession of the three permits to fish for or retain HMS with pelagic longline gear.

This preferred alternative reflects operational capabilities the of the longline permit system and it clarifies our operational practices. And we do not expect any significant changes in historical fishing practices, fishing efforts, or economic However, there will economic impact. be benefit to the 40 former tuna longline permit holders that were recently informed that they weren't eligible to renew their tuna longline permit. So that universe will experience some economic benefit.

Now, I'd just like to switch gears and talk about the proposed rule regarding Atlantic shark identification workshop. The consolidated HMS FMPrequired that dealers and/or proxies attend an Atlantic shark identification workshop to renew their permit. This was primarily to improve the accuracy of the reporting of shark species,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and this regulation became effective this past January.

Dealers that attend these workshops will receive a certificate for each location listed on their permit. However, if they opt to send a proxy to these workshops, they must send a proxy for each location listed on their dealer permit. Dealers may not receive shark products unless they have an Atlantic shark identification workshop certificate on their premises.

So the important point here is if the dealer him or herself attends, they'll get a certificate for each location listed on their permit. However, if they have a proxy attend, they're going to have to send a proxy for each of the locations listed on their permit.

We've heard that dealers might not receive shark products at all of the locations listed on their permit. Therefore, it seems unnecessary to require workshop certification

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

for those locations. It's currently not feasible to modify our permit database to identify only locations that actually receive shark products on the Atlantic shark dealer permit.

All right. What that means is that for each dealer, we have a list of locations. We have one list of locations, regardless of whether they're receiving shark or red snapper or grouper or kingfish, we have one list of locations for each dealer and that goes on each dealer permit. It's not feasible for us to modify that list only for the identification workshop include to only locations that receive shark products. I explained that clear.

The alternatives for this, one is the status quo alternative. A preferred alternative is to require a certificate for each place of business where Atlantic sharks are first received. So that's the difference.

Rather than for each location listed on their

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

permit, just make this requirement for each location that actually receives shark products.

Then the second component is to dealers trucks require the and other conveyances possess a copy of a valid workshop certificate. That was added at the request of Office Enforcement primarily the of Law because not all dealers locations are located where the sharks are off loaded. So it's just to be able to have that certificate on the receiving the truck that might be products and then taking it back to an inshore type of location.

proposed regulation really This only affects a very narrow universe of shark dealer permit holders. That would be those permit holders, first of all, that opt to send a proxy to a workshop. Two, they have locations listed their dealer multiple on And, three, that they only receive permit. shark products at some of those locations.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

actually it's a very narrow universe that this regulation would impact. However, the requirement for trucks and other conveyances to possess a copy of the workshop certificate would affect all shark dealer permit holders.

Ultimately, the preferred alternative eliminates the need for a dealer to send a proxy to a workshop for a location that does not receive shark. As a result, it would reduce the economic burden by reducing the number of proxies that may be required to shark identification attend workshops. However, identification and reporting accuracy will not be compromised because every location that first receives sharks would still be required to have the certificate.

Also, dealer trucks and other conveyances would be considered extensions of the dealer and would be required to possess a copy of the dealer certificate. So that kind of closes up the truck issue if the dealer location is not where the sharks are being off

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

loaded.

As I said earlier, the public hearings, there's going to be three of them the first week in May, Gloucester, St. Petersburg, and Silver Springs. The comment period closes May 12<sup>th</sup> and here's all the information regarding the submission of public comments on this proposed rule. Thank you.

MS. MERRITT: Thank you. Rita Merritt, South Atlantic Council. Just a question regarding permits. I'm not familiar with shark dealer permits. Are they issued to individuals or to entities?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, they're actually issued to both where on the application they could actually apply underneath a corporation or they can apply as an individual. So it can go either way based upon how that individual or entity wants the permit issued.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Dewey Hemilright.

I have just a couple questions and some

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	comments about this because I have a little
2	history on this. And I find it kind of ironic
3	that we're just figuring out that 40 permit
4	holders didn't have their Atlantic tuna
5	longline permit. Some of us had to go pay
6	tens of thousands of dollars for some permits
7	and it looks like to me here that these 40
8	permit holders, I would venture to say,
9	probably could be selling the permits. That's
10	why they need this thing. And it probably
11	more likely I don't see a whole bunch of
12	directed swordfishermen in boat capability
13	going fishing, meaning some tonnage. So it
14	kind of seems like to me that this is
15	basically just to allow people who didn't
16	follow the law before when other ones had to
17	by making sure that they had their directed
18	general category tuna or Atlantic tuna
19	longline permit when you all did this about,
20	what was it, six years ago, seven years ago.
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible.]

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

MR. HEMILRIGHT:

22

Longer than that.

1

2 3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So we're talking about eight or nine years ago, heck, we'll just say eight years and in 2007 we're just figuring out that these 40 So when I see this going into didn't have it. effect, I don't see no tonnage being caught. I see just maybe people selling a permit to the highest people down south and somebody getting a little economic value there when everybody else played ball from the beginning.

Ι mean you all put different spin on it here, but I expect that my conclusion is little bit closer а reality. So by sitting here telling everybody in this room that the historical practices, fishing effort and economic practices, significant changes, well, it is. I mean, basically, this is just fixing it for the people who didn't keep up with the law as some of us did and it's a chance to sell their stuff whether it be buoy gear or rod and reel fishery in South Florida.

So maybe when you come, you know,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

some people might not understand it, but you should put the honest face on it because I think up there in Gloucester you all have tons of phone calls, tons of phone calls about this, and this is the picture that you decided to show here that people didn't know. Well, they knew. They just didn't keep up with it seven, eight years ago when some of us did. So basically this is just a way to sell your permit.

And my second question -- well, that was just an observation. The second question would be, if I have an incidental swordfish permit and an incidental shark permit, are you going to give me an Atlantic tuna longline permit?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Underneath the proposed rule, if you have qualified for that shark permit and the swordfish permit during the '99 FMP and have maintained those permits throughout the duration, you would receive the Atlantic tuna's longline permit as

results of the preferred alternative proposed.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: And maybe you should be more forthright on selling the reason for this, is that people want to be able now to sell the permits. And it's obvious that in this [tape is blank].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A couple of points to respond to that. One of the points that I was trying to make is that they in some instances could not comply with the regulation because the permit could not be issued if they did not have a vessel. So if they sold their vessel, but wished to retain their permit, they were unable to renew that permit just because of the characteristics of the computer program that administers those permits.

And to your second point, if they do choose to sell those permits, possibly they would sell those to somebody who would choose to utilize those permits and that, in fact, is one of the things that we would actually like to see as a result of this rule.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hang on one second, Joe. Let me stay in the queue here. So hold on, hold on. You're not up yet. We'll give you an extra minute then. So it's Rusty, Ron, and then Terri.

MR. HUDSON: Rusty Hudson, Directed Shark. I guess I have like two questions, two different parts here.

So the first question, the location issue for the shark dealer, does that substantively change I believe it's the CFR 635.28 section B, section 3, which has to do with if your closed in one region, you send a truck to an open region, that technically they were illegal? You just had let us know that last Fall after nearly four years when you put that into effect back December 24<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

So my question is, with the non-sandbar approach that you're having, the two regions for the future if you go final with all that, if you're on the east coast and let's say it gets closed down for non-sandbar

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

for some reason, then you send your truck over
to the other side, or, even still, you have
four or five locations with your company and
one of those companies is on the west coast,

are those trucks illegal for having purchased

6 that?

Because we were told last fall that those trucks were illegal for having gone and purchased in an open Gulf of Mexico, something they had done for decades, and so I just want to make sure the dealers have: (1) the option to prosecute their business as normal and, (2) not to get in trouble and to be able to deal with this comment and public hearing coming up because there's a couple of dealers that may pop up over at St. Pete on May 6<sup>th</sup>. I won't be in town, so I can't be there.

So I need to be able to give them you all's expertise on, first, the law that exists today, and then the law that may exist after this rule goes final. You can answer that question, then I'll go to my second

question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: The change that's proposed here would not affect any of that. It basically would be requiring the trucks that are part of the dealer, that are an extension of the dealer, they should have a copy of that workshop in the truck. The rest of it is unaffected.

MR. HUDSON: So it still would be illegal if it's closed on the east coast unless if a caveat that he has a location on that west coast that's listed, or does he have to go and get a separate permit for that region? You know, this is an option that some of them can get themselves a little place and be able to have the truck operate out of.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Any place that trucks are received will need the workshop certificate on the premise. If there is a truck that's part of that location, an extension of that location, it will need a copy in the truck.

1	MR. HUDSON: Well, the workshop
2	wasn't what I was going after as far as ar
3	answer. I'm trying to find out if the dealers
4	can go back to the traditional practice of
5	purchasing in other regions and then being
6	able to eventually bring it to his own fish
7	house if it's closed in his region, which is
8	like in the Cape Canaveral area for the persor
9	in for instances, or down in the Keys for
10	instance, and then be able to still, you know,
11	try to go back to the old way of being able to
12	purchase sharks in the open region.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I understand the issue that you're raising, and what I'm trying to clarify is that this rule, this proposed change, does not affect that. Those regulations are remaining in effect. The shark final rule to the amendment will have some impact on how the fishery operates, but this rule does not affect any of that.

MR. HUDSON: Okay. So the answer is, no, that they still cannot go and purchase

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

in an open when it's closed in their area based on where their permit is issued and the trucks have to have a copy of the workshop.

Now, my second question has to do with the workshop. You have the desire to put fins on the carcass for the unload. The shark ID workshop deals with a half a carcass from the first dorsal, or actually behind the first dorsal, right on back and you're dealing off the second dorsal and an anal fin, and maybe ventral fins. And, technically, not even the ventral fins because only the dorsal, second dorsal, and the anal fin is required currently.

It would behoove you to have the person that's teaching the workshops be able to have access to not only the legal sharks, but the prohibited sharks to be able to get different life stages and sexes of such like duskies to be able to then ensure that your dealers have good ID skills. That's something that he and I discussed the other day, but he

cannot go riding out on the pond. But the scientist that can take a dead dusky, for instance, put it on the boat and then give him the option to be able to: (1) take the pictures of the fins, or maybe law enforcement has some in their inventory.

You know, there's a way to be able to increase the likelihood that the dealers are going to be more accurate with their ID. That's really where we're trying to get to with your 100 percent identification ability for the dealers and for the fishermen. So to achieve that goal, you need to expand his teaching outreach material, and that's what I'm suggesting is part of the question, or whatever, for these workshops.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

I mean we've tried to and can work with a number of different ways of getting samples of the different species. I know that he's created kind of logs, permanent logs from some of them. So we can work on all that.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. CODDINGTON: Yes. Ron Coddington. I've got some other comments. Some of them are going to echo what Dewey said about the 40 permits.

It looks like what we're doing is we're rewarding 40 privileged individuals that have not helped this fishery a bit because, presumably, these 40 permits are parked as They're not on the water. no-vessel IDs. They've allowed the Atlantic tuna permit to expire or been forced to. But these aren't boats that are fishing.

Anyone out there that holds one of the limited access permits realizes that they know that they get several mailings a year from people trying to buy those permits. Ιt looks like what we're doing is we're taking these 40 people, rewarding them for helping the fishery, and park them as no-vessel IDs, which there's been comments from this advisory panel to do away with no-vessel IDs. We're not going to catch quota

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

with a no-vessel ID.

These things are being carried as an investment and they're going up every year. We know specifically one permit that just moved out of Florida, probably coming back to Florida, but moved for \$45,000 for a hand gear permit. I don't think there's anybody in this room that can come up with a way to catch our swordfish quota without putting boats on the water. If we're going to reward these 40 individuals, and all we're doing is monetarily rewarding them, and you might be rewarding them to the tune of \$40,000 a piece, there's a lot of money at stake here, and I guess for that purpose it's worth us spending our time.

But we're going to spend our time on this for 40 privileged individuals. If we're going to do this, there certainly should be some kind of sunset clause or something in it if you're not going to use the permit. We're back to the use it or lose it, and you're just not going to catch swordfish

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

quotas with a limited access permit that continually dwindles down in numbers and, in part, because we park them as no-vessel IDs waiting for the top dollar.

I don't think that's what's going to help our swordfisheries. We need to look why we should be rewarding these for not helping our individuals fishery. There's differences, there's exclusions, all this. Certainly some of these are real people that want to go fishing, but a vast majority of these are like Dewey said, it's dollars. It has nothing to do with tonnage, no tonnage is going to put on the dock.

And if you move some of these permits, which the first place they're going to be looked at to move is to the buoy fishery in South Florida, and by now I think everybody realizes that the buoy fishery is really only working and being explored in depth in South Florida. It will work in other areas. People aren't doing it. So we're looking at permits

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that are going to simply provide dollars to these 40 people.

A percentage of these are going to end up in the buoy fishery, which is not going to put -- it's a good fishery, but it's not going to put a lot of tonnage on the board that we need for ICAT. These are some of the considerations we need to be looking at with this 40 permit rule.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I don't disagree with anything that you said. another category of vessel owners out there that this would affect that are included within that 40, and those would be trawlers that, because of the need to have the three permits, these squid trawl vessels have to have a tuna longline permit, and somewhere over the course of those last eight, ten years since limited access permits went in, I don't know for whatever reason, but the need to renew these permit, a longline permit for a trawl vessel may have escaped them. So

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there's another group of vessels out there as well, too.

MS. BEIDEMAN: Terri Beideman. Thanks, Rick, for the presentation, although something else comes to mind when you say trifecta. It's certainly not pelagic longline fishing.

I have a little bit different spin on this. I say it's a no-brainer. You got people throwing away or can't fish, can't sell their permits, can't enable a boat to go, they can't contribute because they can't fish. If they don't have all three permits, then they're not allowed to go, so they can't contribute.

I know people that got caught up in that, and Dewey's right, some of them had to pay for it. But there aren't enough permits. That's what we've discovered. They've gone through attrition because they're tied to dock numbers of vessels and people have lost their vessels or sold them. And I recognize that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

some hanging onto it just for economics. But

we need boats, like you say, Ron, out on the

water fishing, and we need permits to be able

to do that. So I say first step.

My first question, though, really is, is this the entire extent of your permit revision that you are proposing? Because when we were here the last time, our number one recommendation at every single breakout table was to allow LAP, swordfish and tuna and shark permits to be reinstated for whatever reason people lost them.

And I recognize there's plenty of stupid people out there, but we need boats on the water. And these are people that were originally issued permits in 1999 with the FMP and for whatever reason have lost them through attrition. They didn't renew them.

At one point, swordfish, you had to renew them every year. Then they changed it to every other year, and people got confused.

You know, fishermen, they have a lot more to

think about than permits coming in the mail.

There's weather and such.

So is this the extent of your revision that's supposed to deal with the entire issue, just issuing new, allowing? Because, frankly, the tuna longline permit, and I was pretty much watching this '99 rule pretty well; I'm certain of that, and it seemed to me that it was like slight of hand because I didn't even know that you were putting in a limited access tuna when you switched it from an incidental permit to a tuna longline permit.

That's where you snagged up the They got caught up in that because trawlers. you changed the name. Ιt from went an incidental tuna permit to a tuna longline permit and I didn't even realize it limited access myself, but in we were middle of doing it.

But do you have plans to reinstate LAPs permits or perhaps open permitting?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: you know, I think the following session is going to talk a bit about some of the other And you're right, a lot of these options. things have come up before.

What this rule is trying to do is fix what we recognize as an immediate problem. And a lot of the other suggestions that came up in the last AP permitting would take more work, more analyses, bigger picture kind of stuff. And so we'll have that session right after this one.

In terms of the original change, actually, the inclusion of the tuna longline in the limited access program was an industry request to ensure that tuna were not bycatch and we were not having the permitting and reporting for all of the species that would likely be caught on longline.

Now, the name change, you know, I some folks getting caught up by could see It was an intent to be more specific that.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

about what the primary gear was. Incidental was confusing to a lot of folks and what that meant, and so is an attempt to be a little more descriptive. But, yes, we would also have captured some of the non-longline folks.

But, minimally, that's a small group.

MS. BEIDEMAN: Thanks. I do recall that, actually, that we requested that the three permits be, because we didn't want people out there with one permit throwing away tunas, and with two permits throwing away swordfish. It's wasteful and that's kind of what you got.

But, in the name change, that happened during that rule and they were not limited. You could still get an incidental permit. They were not limited and that's the difference that you did there. You may have changed the name, but you also made it a limited permit and that was never the case when it was incidental.

So if I can speak to other permit

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

issues at another point, I will do that. So I'm going to stop now, but I'm relieved to hear that this isn't where you're going to end because we certainly want much more than it states.

MR. MONTELLA: Vince Montella. Reissuing these 40 permits, does that create the balance that you're looking for? Or will more tuna longline permits have to be issued for other shark and sword incidentals that are out there? In other words, do those 40 permits create complete trifectas?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The way the rule, the preferred alternatives articulated is with that 40 is essentially a ballpark of the universe there. That the ratio of those swordfish permits, whether they be directed or incidental, would meet the same number of Atlantic tuna permits in circulation to complete that package to enable vessels to participate in the fishery.

MR. MONTELLA: All right. And I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

understand the ultimate goal is to get more
boats on the water. And this might make some
sense if there wasn't inactive tuna longline

4 permits out there now.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

How many tripacs are out there now that are inactive that are reporting no fish every month? And it goes back to the use it or lose it. Why wouldn't we just say you have 12 months to use your longline permit or else it gets put back into the system and then like reissued? Why said, are we, Ron rewarding people for their lack when, I mean, Brad, you have the numbers, how many tuna permits do you have out there and how many are actually reporting fish?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I don't have the numbers off the top of my head. But as far as numbers of vessels that have all three permits in conjunction, 245, 250 I think is kind of where the universe is at. And so another additional 40 vessels that this rule would address is a considerable jump in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	relative to the fleet size.
2	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
3	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
4	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I don't
5	have the information to confirm that.
6	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
7	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And,
8	Vinny, just as far as data goes, where up in
9	our Gloucester shop, we see where incidental
10	bluefin are caught because that's our primary
11	focus in our shop is tallying bluefin tuna
12	quota. So for those vessels that, say, may be
13	buoy fishing that are hitting the yellow fin
14	or bigeye, if they're not encountering
15	bluefin, I don't have direct, immediate access
16	to confirm how many of those permits are
17	actively being used.
18	MR. MONTELLA: All right. It's
19	like I said, I just think it's made it's
20	like Dewey said, it's for monetary reasons
21	here. You know, some of those may get back on

the water. I think there's enough permits out

there now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And doesn't this open the door for 700-some-odd swordfish permits that were issued back in the '80s to be renewed because, oh, they didn't know they had to renew them? I mean how many people have -- well, I it would be tuna incidental, incidental looking for a swordfish permit, directed species. Doesn't this open the door for reissuing other permits to trifectas?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, at least not in this particular rulemaking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: In principle I guess we could look at that, and as Margo had mentioned the presentation I'll be giving after this one here where we're looking at permit reform both in what we've heard from the advisory panel and previous meetings, and discussing, prioritizing those and looking at the scope of what sort of

rulemaking would need to be undertaken to actually implement some of those recommendations to deal with the issues we've experienced. And some of them will be much longer term efforts.

With reauthorization of the Magnuson Act, there's a number of different tools that the councils are using. Some of them apply to our highly migratory fisheries, some of them won't. But that is something we could look at.

But as we're in this kind of new environment of we're so accustomed to trying to limit effort, limit catch to rebuild stock, well, quite frankly, it's somewhat of a different environment when all of a sudden, well, we have one that's rebuild and how do we prosecute that fishery without creating the same errors that we've made in the past.

So opening up the flood gates and letting every vessel back in, probably not good for the resource or the industry. So

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that's something that we would need to (a) look at, but also what all the pros and cons associated with it.

MR. MONTELLA: But when you sit down and you look at the number of permits that are currently issued and the amount of vessels that are reporting fish, landings, you have this big number here and you have this little number here, and those people are just holding onto them for somebody like myself was shopping for a permit recently and had to pay a lot of money for it. now you're telling me I had 40 more to chose Maybe Ι should from, you know. have negotiated better.

Ιt just doesn't that seem enough permits out there's there at the You know, use it or lose it. boats in Hawaii that have had them for 15 years and haven't reported a fish. You know what, get them back into the system, give them back to you guys. Probably those guys didn't

pay for them to begin with, and if they did, they lose out. You know what, nobody told you to buy it. You know what, get it back into the system, create a pool system to people who actually want to put some financial investment

And another things is if these 40 boats here, I mean to renew it and to allow them to turn around and all of a sudden send in an application for transfer to your office a week later seems ridiculous. You know, show some financial investment, substantial investment. You want to build a boat, fine; we'll renew your permit. If you're not going to build a boat, why should we let you make 40,000 bucks off a permit.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Your pooling comment is very good and I that's more appropriate for the long Right now the regulations, they're not constructed handle perform to or that function. particular And where this SO

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

into buying boats.

rulemaking is very focused, I think that recommendation is more in something that we'll be looking for in the next go round is how do we in the longer term address some of this latent effort.

And we fully understand that when you make anything limited access, that there's an inherent value that comes along with that.

And as the swordfish fisheries become rebuilt and these modified regulations that attest to upgrade restrictions or retention limits, that there's a value associated with that.

There's still of the some overarching issues where do we have swordfish quota that we're looking to hold onto, and how do we, as an Agency, and you industry, develop all, as an а way prosecute that sustainably.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If I could just follow up on some of the numbers.

As Brad said, there are about 245 triple permit combos. And there are about 300

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	combined swordfish directed and incidental
2	permits. So conceivably there could be
3	potentially about 300 triple combos, 300
4	longline vessels.
5	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
6	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I don't
7	have that information.
8	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
9	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I don't
10	know, don't know.
11	MR. AUGUSTINE: Pat Augustine. A
12	lot of questions came up as a result of Ron's
13	comment, and then it followed on with Terri,
14	and so on, saying, well, maybe we need the 40,
15	maybe we don't need the 40. It just seems to
16	me that, I haven't read anywhere, where you
17	sorted out a specific time frame, such as date
18	certain. From pick a number from 2002 to
19	2007, of those 40 vessels, how many actually
20	fish, and determine I say 2007, let's give it
21	some leniency, say haven't fished in that five

period of time, in my mind all of those

vessels that haven't fished in that time are 1 2 But if you have someone who, like you say, screwed up and missed the date in 2007 to 3 reapply, that's a whole different ball game. 4 Limited entry in my mind, and this 5 6 is another unlimited entry if you will, it 7 does open Pandora's box and I believe it does set precedent. So it would seem to me that if 8 you all haven't considered a time frame as to 9 whether they were in it or out of 10 determine which of the 40 should move forward 11 with an opportunity to fish, I think we should 12 do that to start with. 13 If it goes all the way back to '99, 14 15 then I agree with them, out, wouldn't support 16 this on a bet. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED MATIE [Mr. Ruaisl: 17

UNIDENTIFIED MALE [Mr. Ruais]:
Thank you. Took a long time in seeing some of
this. I think I've had several attacks while
listening to most of this conversation.

I think some of you have this really a bit backwards. To think that you're

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

18

19

20

21

rewarding these privileged people, these are people who had the privilege of being put out of the fishery to rebuild the fishery. That's why they don't use the permits any more because it became uneconomic to do so and they probably lost a lot more of the \$40,000 that that permit might be worth if they don't have intentions on getting back into the fisheries.

squid boats alone, there are several of them that have this the restrictive incidental problem. When limits went down so long, it just didn't even make any sense to get the permit any more. And now the incidental trip limit is up around 15 I believe for the northern squid boats and that could be a significant bump in catch. more importantly, it's a reduction in But, That's one of the reasons why you're discard. trying to do this again.

We're supposedly an ecosystem friendly fishery. We looked to eliminate discard. Some of those permits will be used

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for that.

And I have several specific questions after a while. But you don't want to be one of these privileged few. They're not that.

And there is no trifecta. I'm a gambler. There's no good trifecta in the swordfish fishery right now. Even the southern Florida fishery, I wouldn't take that for too much longer on how to tell how much of a good bet that'll be.

The questions I had were, why were the ATLPs not provided with novice status? Was that just a computer operational thing?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: There's a quick answer of yes, Rich, in that where the southeast regional office as developed their own business practices on how they issued their entire suite of permits, whether it be VHMS permits, snapper, grouper permits, what have you. And they have the capability of disconnecting these limited access permits

from vessels entirely.

That's not the case when the Atlantic tunas in which it's been modified so the HMS permit system was developed where one of the key business rules in the web-based system, which primarily issues open access permits, 35-plus a year, 35,000-plus a year, is that the permit is directly linked to the vessel's coast guard documentation or state registration number.

And so the system, itself, doesn't have that capability to de-link the permit from the vessel. So when an owner actually sells the vessel and wishes to retain the permit, it's like a throwing a wrench into the gear in how the system is currently configured.

And it, also, when the permit holder of some issues as well, when you could potentially have a permit on the books for a vessel you no longer own, I know that's caused some difficulties over the past couple of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	years as well.
2	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Was there a
3	charge for the renewal of the swordfish and
4	shark permits over time?
5	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I
6	forget how the southeast has their scale. But
7	I think it's like \$100 or \$75 for the first
8	fishery, and then like \$25
9	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
10	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes,
11	something for each additional fishery tacked
12	onto the permit.
13	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'd argue that
14	that alone is showing an intent that you were
15	like you had some desire to participate in
16	the fishery or you were continuing to
17	participate in some kind of pelagic fishery
18	along the way.
19	I had other questions, but I've
20	lost them. I someone is going to speak, I
21	might be able.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Thank
2 you.

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, Joe McBride. Just very briefly. What's the cliche? I have no dog in this fight. But I'm listening here to two things: first, from nowhere listening to the audience and all the opposition to this proposal, with the exception of Rich, do I see any proponents of this inclusion of those 40 boats that however lost their permits and the young lady [inaudible].

The rest I see in opposition. that sort of says to me as an outsider that it becomes almost more political. If this HMSAP panel, your representatives pretty well up and down the coast and the Gulf, has more opposition for logic -- how does it come into this proposal without one or two people being for it, certainly up and down the coast I saw no speakers other than Rich and the young That's just an observation.

The question I have, if you have 40

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

boats that need to get back into the tuna fishery to go fishing for the three species longlining, why don't you just mandate they have to have a boat to be renew status? I mean maybe I'm being over simplistic here and that would at least morally invalidate what Vince and the other gentleman were complaining that it's in there as a speculation for somebody in one geographic area to be looking to see the permits they have to another geographic area.

I don't think it's a very, very complicated thing. If you want to get back into fishing, what's the name of your boat and do you operate or are you just holding onto the permit? I don't know if I'm over simplistic and you guys know your own business better than I do.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So that was something that we actually considered initially when the limited access system was implemented was that kind of requirement and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

specifically decided at that time not to require, to allow the vessels to be de-linked from the permits so that people could make changes, upgrade or not, or hang onto a permit without having the boat and it gave them more flexibility. So in terms of that as a suggestion for a way forward, I would say that this is something we should talk about this afternoon.

MR. McBRIDE: But if it were moral involved I certainly would. You know there's no mandate to do [inaudible] like that that I have. But, anyhow, it would make more sense if you're going to allow 40 boats in, that those 40 boat owners, however if you want to do it, have a boat to go fishing to increase the landings on swordfish and whatever other fisheries you want to get them involved in. To me it doesn't seem complicated and it would negate the thesis that they were only going back into [inaudible] southern fishermen who need the permit, you know, where the fish are

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	and so forth and so on. But that's out of the
2	mouth of babes because I'm not a
3	swordfisherman [inaudible] just commercial.
4	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I
5	think there are some folks who do have
6	vessels, some of the squid trawlers, and it's
7	not like this is 40 brand new people coming
8	in. These are people who have qualified for
9	their swordfish and shark limited access
10	permits and haven't maintained them. And for
11	a variety of reasons have lost or have somehow
12	don't now have the tuna longline.
13	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
14	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I
15	don't know the exact number. There may be
16	some in the no-vess ID status for all of them.
17	But according to the rules that we
18	established in '99, that's okay. That's how
19	we designed the system.
20	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Just
21	on that issue, we sent letters to all permit

the

new

holders indicating what

vessels

upgrade restrictions were. We received bunch of correspondence, as well as phone calls, on a variety of the issues involved with whether our documentation was right, what the circumstances of their situation were. have heard support from the panel members on this issue and we have not heard from a lot of the panel members at all. So, you know, the advisory panel, I really appreciate everyone that's contributed, but there are people outside the panel that have weighed in, that have issues both for and against. listened to all of it and we have had some support on the panel.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Here's a member of the fishing community that has all three permits, and I have to tell you there are a number of reasons, as Margo has said, for people to inadvertently or for whatever reason mess up and not get their permit. It happened to me with ground fish in New England. I don't have a ground fish

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

permit any more. I'd love to have one, but, anyway.

Those 40 vessels, none of us know the reason that they don't have that permit. Someone was talking about the fleet in Hawaii that has religiously kept their Atlantic three permits viable. There's no reason for those to go back into the pool. I'd love to have them come back here and fish. But at the moment, whatever reason, not feasible.

permits go back to the swordfish and shark permit holders so that they could get into the system, so that they could be landing product.

Chances are they won't all do that. There's a lot of reasons. Some people have illness.

Some people have -- our boat's been tied up for six months for pete's sakes just with maintenance. We're not contributing to any poundage, but that's a different issue.

Get those permits out so that they can be used, sold, put on a boat, whatever.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

That's really important.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And don't de-link them -- I mean don't keep them linked to the boat because boats sink. Other things happen to them. They're taken out of use for a year or so. You might have to sell it for whatever reason. You need to be able to keep those permits separate from the vessel so that they can be either sold or used on a different boat.

MR. RUAIS: Yes. Rich Ruais. I think it should be clear that those quick. 40 permits, it may be true that some of them would be destined for the South Florida But it's also clear that on a later fishery. discussion item we're going to be talking about the possibility of leasing and So some of those vessels could chartering. actually be used in fisheries on the high seas at some point.

You know my comment is that listening sometimes to the perspective of the recreational side and the South Florida side

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

right now, we think we have -- you can come away with the impression that, well, we think we have almost what we need now; we have an exclusive area to ourselves; we've got a great fishery; small recreational we've got commercial component in there right now; we may expand that a little bit; we've got a few more folks we want to bring in; and then we want to make sure we close it off; and that's the end of our -- you know, if there's more issues, bigger management management like the U.S. quota is going to shrinking, well, that's somebody else's; we've got our little dream world down here.

And management's a little bit more complex and we're going to be in this together, because when the U.S. quota down, don't think that everyone else is just going to collapse and say, okay, just take it out of the remaining commercial side. They're under the incidental catch category. There's going to be quota reductions coming because

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we're being forced to give 50 or 60 percent of the United States quota away because we don't

have enough permits out there.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That pain is going to be shared by all users, and that, righteously, is how the Magnuson Act is set up. It's proportional reductions. It's not we're with some special class that gets to set up the perfect little fishery and you keep issues away from us.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you for that very good discussion and the good comments there regarding that very specific item in regards to permit reform. So I guess a good segue into this presentation.

Unfortunately, I wasn't able attend the October meeting, I've so through the notes, et cetera, to try to get some of the feedback we've heard from you all. And we've actually engaged in some discussions internal to the division as far as looking at permit reform in all its glory, and I use glory loosely.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 Because of the implications 2 when you all of a sudden pick apart what permit reform actually mean, 3 can whether you're looking at short term fixes or actually 4 looking at long term restructuring of 5 6 fishery and how the permit, itself, well, it's 7 not just a piece of paper that gets stuffed in an envelope and thrown on the boat. 8 Ιt actually can be the keystone of how the entire 9 10 fishery is structured and how we desire that to look as we start to encounter some of these 11 like rebuilt fisheries. 12 issues 13 addressing limited access issues where there's

And so what I'll be presenting today is a very brief background history of how we got to this point, going back to the 1999 FMP. There should be a handout there that should provide a little bit more detail listed out in chronological order.

inherent value put on the permit.

And then reflecting back on where we're at currently, some of the issues we've

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

just hit on in this previous discussion. Kind of what we've heard back from the advisory panel of issues you'd like to see the HMS management division tackle. And then I think it's a breakout session after lunch where it's going to be looking really to dig into some of those issues in (a) prioritizing, trying to figure out what level of scope some of those requests mean to the division.

You know, is this a long term project that has multiple years associated with it? Is it something that is more contained in scope that's something we could add onto rulemakings, et cetera?

And then actually use this meeting here more or less as a launching or stepping stone if you will through the Fall AP meeting of '08 here to look at some of these more in depth longer term reform issues that not only we're experiencing here in HMS fisheries, but in some of the fisheries through the Magnuson Reauthorization and it still meet our needs.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 So, again, just to recap, the brief 2 history, I'll run through that quickly. We'll touch on the current landscape of how some of 3 4 our permitting issues are playing out. short term objectives are really where we'd 5 6 like folks to focus on in the breakout session 7 after lunch, and we'll get into that in a little bit more depth. And then kind of look 8 at some of the long term objectives of the 9 10 Fall AP and what resources we have as agency and what resources you all have 11 advisory panel members in structuring some of 12 those discussions.

> I know some of the councils have gone through training whether it be in regards to ACLs or LAPs or sectors, and to see if any of applicability to those have any the fisheries as we manage them into the future.

> prior to the '99 FMP, open Good times for all. You get permits. access. You know, they were pretty straightforward. But, obviously, when you have open access

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fisheries, outside of the seine, purse seine fishery, there are problems that arise with that.

vessel permits were Our species specific in nature. They weren't necessarily geared toward what gears were being used except for the bluefin tuna permit which had a number of subset of categories. And the dealer permits were also species specific. And we didn't have necessarily requirements that you need to hold the three permits trifecta, and simultaneously, [inaudible] a the exempted fishing permits for different activities. I guess letters of authorization were used back then as well.

So why did limited access come about in the first place? Well, essentially, we were looking at the shark fisheries and swordfish fisheries being overfished, overfishing occurring and trying to rationalize the harvesting capacity to match the quota levels we were at. And so this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

eventually equated to the three permits prosecute the longline fishery where the shark permits could be held by themselves for the bottom longlines, and also the creation of the incidental or directed subcategories of those permits, as well as the hand gear permits.

had established a number different qualifying criteria. Pat, to your point, you know, we established time periods, then I think your point setting up qualifications, or verifying that folks had landed fish in a given time period.

But, sure enough, not everybody wanted to fit into the boxes Uncle Sam had Not everyone was directed shark created. fishermen or directed swordfish fishermen, as well as longliners, and that kind of played out very similar to our previous discussion when you really started crunching the numbers and issuing permits that not everyone had kind of fit into those molds.

There was obviously some confusion

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

8

9

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 \_\_\_\_

with any changes, and we're experiencing that As these regulation changes come into still. play, and for a number of years after that '99 FMP, we had issued exempted fishing permits to help accommodate some of those unique business characteristics. But over time the interest waned both from the industry and complexity to manage that from the Agency's perspective grew and I think it was about two years that we stopped issuing those EFPs and kind of made folks make the decision.

So once the [inaudible] FMP went into place? Well, we've now got recreational permit that not only applies to tunas, but for our highly migratory species. The same goes with the charter head boat, we've revamped our exempted permit considerably where now we have permits that are issued to aquariums for display. We have chartering permits, research permits, cetera.

We have through the efforts of

ICAt, we have an international trade permit.

No longer are these domestic permits good enough to either import or export product.

The data collection wasn't quite adequate. So we had this new international trade permit that's in effect for a number of the HMS species.

We've had some gears added. The buoy gear is probably the one that's most prevalent here because of it's applications in There have been others. swordfish fishery. The recreational spearfish, spear guns have been added for Atlantic tunas and I know that there's some rulemaking that will be discussed They'll be looking tomorrow. at some additional gears.

Through that swordfish revitalization rule, we've looked at retention limits. We've looked at whether or not to break away from some of the other regions. Limitations on vessel upgrades both for safety and harvesting capacity. And we just touched

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

base on some of that longline rule and we'll be discussing a greenstick rule in a little

bit more detail tomorrow.

So we've touched on this to some degree already, but pretty much need three permits, the shark, swordfish, and tuna, to prosecute the longline fishery, the pelagic longline fishery.

in the tuna We have IBOs purse seine quota and how that fishery is managed. tuna permit, at The least the commercial permits, are still primarily managed or broken out into gear types: the harpoon; the general category which is primarily rod and reel, although there is some flexibility there, et We need to have those additional cetera. As I mentioned, the EFPs have been permits. broken out, refined, and specified for specific activities. And we still have the dealer permits stemming around the domestic species that are being acquired from vessels.

To touch back on kind of, well, is

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 this permit just a piece of paper that 2 paying the 25 bucks for so when I get boarded by the boys in the blue uniforms they can show 3 4 that I'm legal? Yes, that serves one purpose. But when you really start to look at what 5 6 that one piece of paper does, it affects just 7 about everything you can do on the water: the 8 species you can catch; where you can catch them; what sort of gear you need on board; do 9 10 you need a VMS, do you not; what's the size of the vessel that you can have, what you can 11 upgrade to. 12

You know, all these different aspects so when we really start to engage in what permit reform may need, it's tendrils run deep and pretty much touches every corner of our regulations and how that impacts you all, whether you be a recreational fisherman, a charter fisherman, or a commercial fisherman.

But currently we kind of have three frames of how these permits are issued. They're either open access, limited access, or

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

we have the IFQ or IVQs currently right now. And they all have pros and cons that go along with them, and their own applications based upon what sector of the fishery they're being applied to.

And with that, well, there's issues that come along with these. And this is I think where in the breakout group we'll kind of really want to focus on some of these issues, and the comments we've heard from you all is how to tackle some of these issues and how they stack and rack up against one another of where the Agency really needs focusing in the short term as the level of importance of these issues start to compete with one another and compare to one another.

So some of them we've touched on. permits How the are just issued. operational logistics of how HMS is You don't necessarily have our own region. infrastructure at our disposal and where a lot of that conducts as a partnership and what are

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

some of the limitations there and the business rules, how they were developed over time.

of the pitfalls of having Some sunset provisions and how do you manage these permits to prosecute rebuilt fisheries in a sustainable manner [inaudible] making errors that may have occurred in years past to get us in certain predicaments. And the ability of how permits intertwine, whether or not you have limited access permits; charter head boat permits and what sort of bag limits apply, what sort of size restrictions apply; when can you sell, when can you not; do you have four people on board, do you have three; who's the paying passenger.

Just the complexity when you start to layer these rules that have come on year after it's almost like year. Ι mean [inaudible] and sediment. It builds up and builds up and the complexity is there. there a way to do business more streamlined and better? Can we strip some of the layers

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And then some of the regulations we

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

away to benefit not only the Agency, but the industry, the folks that need to abide by these regulations for their livelihood?

some of the issues, I think there'll be a presentation I believe tomorrow that will be touching on some of the issues that have come up on how to tackle Caribbean and what we're experiencing there, experiencing there. Levels or not confusions as these rules change, you know, what permits do I need to do activities at? just touched on that with the tuna And we longline permit.

And, you know, how do we manage when these stocks do become rebuilt? You know, what tools do we then have at our disposal? The Agency right now, for the most part, is focused on the getting to rebuilt. Okay, we're here. Wa-hoo! Pat ourselves on the back. Pat all yourselves on the back. Now what? And how do we do that sustainably?

1 have in place. It's not all permits and we do 2 have these tools that we've used at whether it modification, 3 disposal be gear 4 bycatch reduction measures, protect the resources, a huge issue that we deal with and 5

7 the management side and on the industry side.

influences how we conduct ourselves both on

those are going to be We'll bring those slides back up after lunch. And a number of the different options and potential solutions that we've heard coming from you all and your constituent base and items that we've come up and pilfered from other fisheries that may work, maybe they won't. But we at least need to explore them if they have some applicability in to see tackling the issues that we face year in and And some of these issues year out. relatively new, but some of them are rather longstanding.

And so I think this, again, is where we're going to want to focus our

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

attention after lunch. It'll provide a nice little heartburn for everybody.

Some of the options, you know, and I'm not reading the slides intentionally. can read them for yourselves, but they kind of run the full gamut of looking at permits; looking at different market measures, potentially, such as it plays into swordfish; and trying to address some of the complexity that's built up over time if it's even feasible and it may not be when you try to Well, the next potential may strip it down. be as complex. So maybe that's just how it needs to be handled.

Another key element is how we're going to want to prioritize these issues. I think in Margo's overview presentation yesterday, it's pretty apparent that we're not sitting on our hands in any of the regions or here in headquarters. We have a full plate. And where we're in fifth year, pretty much consistently at this stage, when you don't

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

will sixth year, that we prioritize these issues on (a) the need for fishery, both the industry the and the resources, and what resources we have as a division to allocate to tackling some these. So we're looking at full blown FMP amendments that may have two-year time frames with them. Or are they something more of framework action that we could do with environmental effect. That would be more of a fast track item.

But we'll need each of the tables during that breakout group to probably rank some of these. You know, what are the top three issues that you all feel that the Agency needs to address now? And can those issues be addressed now? Maybe they can't. Maybe the time frame is a little too long. But how can some of those be grouped, or do they need to be separated out and handled individually kind of like this tuna longline rule, or to get at some of the comprehensive permit reform that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you mentioned there, Terri?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So I know that was kind of quick in running through it, hit a number of different items, you know, planning to react to there, but I think it will be more appropriate in that breakout group to discuss more the finite details in some of the faster track, shorter scale issues that the Agency and the division can tackle. But also wanted to put folks on notice that as we gear up for the meeting, that we'll be wanting to look at some of these larger issues as we look at permit reform and bring everyone's expertise to the table.

You know, what are they experiencing in their different fisheries? Are there better ways of doing business, that instead of doing say a Band-aid technique and, okay, yes, we did this rulemaking, but didn't quite meet the needs [inaudible], but a Band-aid on it. Okay. Well, there's only so many layers of Band-aids that you can apply to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

something before those Band-aids become ineffective, and I think that's something that in parallel we'll want to tackle these shorter term issues, but also try to look at the bigger picture as we move forward to see if there are better ways of doing business. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We are scheduled for lunch. We have time set up for after lunch to work on this problem in cell groups and then for report out for larger group discussion. It's up to you if you want to take a couple of minutes right now and ask any specific questions. I don't mean issues or observations or recommendations now. I mean any specific questions of Brad about the presentation. Go ahead, Rusty.

MR. HUDSON: Rusty Hutson, Directed Shark. I only have a brief question.

With regards to the compliance guide, is that still sent to the permit holders when they renew, or has that been

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

# discontinued?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It does not go out to each permit holder. How we've disseminated that is we have a number of bound copies upon request. We've also I believe on both of the websites that we maintain, the HMS homepage, had links to that compliance guide. As well as we've made it available to the permit website, hmspermits.gov, that it's available there I think in a Q&A format where folks query where they don't have to go through the entire document, or they can print it out from there themselves.

MR. HUDSON: I guess in short my concern was that by sending it to the permit owners you wound up getting to them with the latest regs, particularly on the inside cover with the What's New section. By depending on them to be computer literate and/or other types of situations, I just think that you're missing an opportunity to communicate with them.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

UNIDENTIFIED

 $\mathsf{MALE}$ 

SPEAKER:

Excellent point, Rusty. It's some of the balancing act when you have 35,000-plus permit holders and sometimes budget can be an issue just sending when you're out а one-page letter, some of the cost associated with that versus when you start to put in all the information that you want folks to be aware of. Obviously, there's a huge benefit to that that you're delivering to them with permit, with the renewal letter, and accommodating those folks that either aren't accustomed to jumping on the web or like to. But it's that balancing act that we try to hold each year of trying to find what can we economically put into that mailing to get out to the 35,000 versus what do we have to make available to other needs.

MR. HUDSON: As quick а observation, part of that 35,000 total is the I'm more concerned about new HMS reg permit. the two sectors we call commercial and for

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	hire, and those are the folks that I believe
2	benefit the most immediately from knowing all
3	these regs as opposed to the private citizen
4	with the HMS reg. Maybe there is a way for
5	them to you know, to make it more
6	economical. I just want to look out for the
7	hundreds of boats and the couple thousand
8	charter boat, head boat guys, and that's
9	really the universe I was thinking about.
10	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We've
11	been able to do that in years past to some
12	degree, peer outs and mailings and what gets
13	included, and that's something we look at on
14	an annual basis based upon how many coins are
15	in our pocket essentially. Thanks.
16	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Brad, what was
17	the method of mailing for the Atlantic tuna
18	longline permit? Was it return receipt, or
19	just regular mail? Registered?
20	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: In
21	regards to?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Renewal.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: In the
renewal, it doesn't go out registered or
certified. What we do is we look back at the
previous year's list of permit holders across
the board, regardless of commercial,
recreational, for hire, and we send out a
renewal letter that says, okay, the system
will be operational from May $1^{ m st}$ , and that you
can either obtain your application through
these different ways, you can go to the
website, you can renew via the telephone. So
in that renewal letter we inform them of what
vehicles they have at their disposal to get
that permit renewed by regular mail, by
regular mail.
(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
went to lunch and was off the record at 12:00
p.m. and back on the record at 1:30 p.m.)
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: But

considering the issues, problems listed in the

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

presentation -- can folks sit down, please? We're going to go ahead and get started.

Actually, while folks are gathering, we don't have a flip chart for the middle table and so we thought if you wanted to move to another table, the side tables, that that might work well.

Okay. Here we go. So I hope you folks have found a table and every table should have a HMS staff person there. If you just remember, what we typically ask is that a AP member serve as the [inaudible] and as the report backs just because this is your input to us.

do have staff available We to questions help guide the and answer conservation, but really this is your time. And so what we thought we would pose to you to guide your discussion would be two question considering the issues and problems listed in the morning presentations and any other issues identified either by you or by anybody else.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

What are the top two most important issues or problems that you would like addressed? If you've got three, that's fine. If it's only one, that's fine, too. But we're trying to get priority action items. And then for each issue, what do you think some of the solutions and options and steps of actions that would need to be taken?

So just some guidance, some things that we're looking for, action items, priorities, things like that. So we'll leave this up and I think we've got about 45 minutes for discussion before we report out back to the group.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Let me add one more thing to Margo's instructions. There are two slides in the presentation from just before lunch that I believe actually entitled issues, many of which came from works that you did in the last AP meeting and there are some things that didn't come from there also. But you're not restricted to just those

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

	two structs worth of issues to discuss. Those
2	are things that have come up before. They'll
3	look familiar to you. But if you come up with
4	something new that's not on those lists,
5	that's certainly fair game in this
6	conversation. So you're not restricted to
7	picking the best two out of that list of eight
8	or ten. You can come up with a new one if
9	you'd like.
10	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
11	went off the record for breakout sessions.)
12	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: family and
13	wife prevail, though you'll enjoy with that,
14	or you'll get a divorce and you'll get on with
15	your life.
16	(Laughter.)
17	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The other part
18	is we believe we need to create provisional
19	permits that should be one to two years long.
20	There's no other way we're going to catch
21	this quota no matter what you guys do, no

matter how good you are. So we think those

provisional permits would take the pressure off of these 40 people. It takes the value off of these 40 vessels here who can't use these and probably want to sell them who'll probably take \$40 for that permit. We're not going to sell it for 30 or 40,000.

And as this progresses, if the provisional permits work and we start catching a legal amount of quota, then it'll be the responsibility of the manager to look at how close we are to getting to that 80 percent or 90 percent of the quota, at which time they have the ability of turning into emergency rule and shut the quota down.

So we think that may be one of the simplest ways to do it. And at the bottom we said, reporting simplicity, all of that simple as possible, KISS, keep it simple stupid. And I'm stupid and I thank you very much.

Any questions from our group here?

Anything you guys want to add? Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: -- for permit

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

standardization. There are all these different identified that ways that we [inaudible]. They're iffy by [inaudible] type. They're iffy by target species, by bycatch and what bycatch you sell. can Whether you're fishing recreational, for hire, commercial, whether or not what type harvest limits you have. If they're bad [inaudible] quotas, whatever type of limits, harvest [inaudible] you have established to your fishery.

So in just starting to discuss it, we were looking at possibly limiting or standardizing all permits to be issued just by gear type or/and what type of fishery, whether it's recreational, for hire, or commercial and quite a few [inaudible].

But still within those things, keep the concept of limited access, [inaudible] limited access by gear type, keep incidental concepts like for non-HMS fisheries that might incidentally harvest an HMS species. You can

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

like say different trawl fishery, incidentally harvesting sharks. You could still make that a shrimp trawl incidental HMS permit or something like that.

And so we realize that there are probably some situations that probably wouldn't work, but there's a lot more that it would work than not work. That's what we were coming up with and we [inaudible]. If we had until next week to discuss it, we'd probably been able to figure it out.

And also, I mean the third issue we identified, utilize the permitting process to effort eliminate latent in different fisheries. That may very well tie back to standardizing permits. We've the got situation of -- we've got fisheries that we've got a lot of latent permits that aren't selling any landings. What happens if they transferred all got and started showing landings? What would that do to quotas and what would that do to just the management of a

species in general? So that's a real concern
with latent efforts. You know, is there a
way in standardizing permits that you could
maybe and quota fisheries [inaudible]
amount of quota per permit and that's it. So
there might be ways to address latent effort
by doing permit standardization also. But we
recognize that latent effort in fisheries and
latent permits do present a real challenge for
management.
And in centralizing permit
issuance, we think that would go a long way

with making things -- keeping it simple. But if office issuing all you have one the permits, then you hopefully have one standard of issuing permits but you get way information every time when you're trying to get information on the permits that you need.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Lisa. [Inaudible.] Fantastic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: First a couple of disclaimers. Some of the discussion

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

association, particularly when we come to the

points, these are not blue water fishermen's

section talking about chartering vessels and

leasing. Those are not established issues.

And, also, Chris suggested that when started

off giving the instructions that we're not

talking about -- we're assuming already that

the rulemaking is under way to solve the

stocks permits, the LAPs permits, the 40

permits, which would have been my number one

highest priority for now.

But we started off, Rick was very strong on the highest priority has to be to find a way to make sure we save the swordfish quota, which means you have to address the impediments to the high seas fishery. And you'll see, Rick will make his points at the end. We differ over some of the [tape is silent].

That's something that needs to be taken out in public hearings to figure out exactly what it should be. And at the same

time we have a concern that we've stated it, you know, while we're doing this, we want the Agency and we will keep an eye on total capacity. We don't want to go back. We don't want to go overboard and create a situation where we're adding more capacity than ultimately the TAC will be able to handle. So

we've got to keep that in mind.

So we need greater capacity to compete on the world stage while ensuring that the fishery does not get over capsulized. And the first option that needs to do that is we need to upgrade the TRT restriction. I think the restriction now is 30 or 35 percent -- 35, 35 percent. So that's a limiting factor.

Option two, we were similar to the table over here where we talked about harmonizing the permit renewal. One of the things that seems to be fairly archaic in this process is that the renewals are staggered throughout the year. It seems to make sense in terms of conveniencing permit holders, in

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

terms of their memory of when their permit is due to give it a standard date for that. So you say something like on January the 1<sup>st</sup> you need to begin the process of getting your renewal and you have to have your new permit in hand by January 31<sup>st</sup>. And at the same time that all the permits we agreed with the recommendation here as well that all the HMS permits issued should come from one location so people don't have to struggle to figure out whether they need to talk to Gloucester or St. Petersburg.

Option three, domestic leasing of the trifect permits necessary for pelagic longline for tunas. This is one of the higher options that we want to be considered. There are a number of sets of these permits that are out there right now. The owners may not very well, in the near future, be looking to enter the fishery. They're just not ready yet to consider getting back in the fishery, but there is demands for those permits. There are

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

some. That's whether they were bottom longline vessels or other types of vessels that are ready to go longlining now and just simply don't have the necessary permits.

We discussed quite a bit of details of that, that we believe it needs to administered by NHMS because of technical difficulties of trying to develop private arrangements between just different Things like if once you lease businesses. somebody's permit, what if you turn out to be Who does that bad performance a bad actor? reflect on once the lease is over? And then you have the potential for fights over the legal fights. If it were in NHMS' lease, hands, NHMS just simply takes a letter coming in from the existing owner of the permits which directs NHMS for the next 12 months, 16 months, whatever it happens to be, maybe it's just on an annualized basis, that the permit for the old sea rover are now going to this boat and that boat is responsible for its

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

performance and [inaudible]. If it does anything wrong, and at the end of the leasing period, the lease permits go back to the original owner in clean fashion.

We draw your attention to in New England, NHMS handles the days at sea leasing program, which is quite complicated among fleet sectors and the number of vessels and the number of species.

Option four, charter and permits allowing foreign vessels to [inaudible] its quota. This is an issue I was hinting at is going to be very sensitive one in my own organization. But yet there are clearly -- I know there's support in the recreational community. I would do this [tape is silent.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I understand the quota of swordfish as a U.S. asset and I don't want to lose it. I strongly question whether we can quadruple our domestic take from our domestic waters. And the only way that I saw to do this is to go into the high

season. I was asking Rich, why can't we do this, and he said there were very serious permitting things still in the way of allowing us to do it. Whether we should or not, we can still argue, but we should have the option. It doesn't make sense that we can't do that.

And as far as your leasing, the only thing that I notice was that table one came up with a one to two year provisional. And maybe these two things are really saying the same thing is that if a current permit holder wanted to voluntarily park it even, just say I will not be using this for two years, that's where you would get the permit to issue your provisional and then we'd find out two years later. But you could tell that person I got two years for you. I can't promise you anything beyond that, but I got two years for you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And the main reason why chartering is good is because if we chartered foreign vessels, that vessel would

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

not be able to fish in U.S. waters, and it would not be able to land in U.S. ports, and it would not be able to fish in EEZ of the chartering country. It basically is relegated to a high seas fishery that then is forced into a transshipment type process. So it clearly is a high seas fishery where you don't see the competition on localized fishing grounds and you don't even see the boat. I think that's the end of what we did.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mike?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. We kind of all had the same thing I think. Everybody wants a simplified permitting office, and I just one, one office, one date, one permit, and we could have something like check boxes for species and/or gear, whatever the need was. There's a lot of frustration among the commercial fishermen of our group, the number of permits. We had a long discussion with lunch and we discovered that maybe somebody in this room is fishing on a species he doesn't

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

even have a permit for and he's considered to

be a good fisherman in our part of the woods.

So it's very difficult. And maybe not only HMS, but NHMS wide, there's a lot of permits we have to have in the South Atlantic that it sure would be nice to make sure that we had everything checked off and everything. There's confusion with dates, confusion with which office you need to go to, and things like that, but I think everybody said that one.

After quite a lengthy discussion, and most of our time was taken up with this one discussion about, whether you believe in it or not, there's been value put on the permits that we have, the trifecta permits. It requires fishermen, if they want to get in the fishery, to go buy one of the three permits for quite a bit of money. So there's value, and what you're going to do, if you take that value away and just give away permits, you're going to penalize the people

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

who've gone in the fishery and bought into a fishery. So if we're going to up the number of permits, don't allow those permits to be sold. They never can be sold and that will keep people from coming in and getting the permit and prospecting on that permit.

And then one other note we had with that, when they were talking about squid trawl and I couldn't figure out. I said I'm new to this game. Somebody's got to tell me why a squid trawler needs a pelagic longline permit.

And maybe one of the things that we could possibly do -- I know there's an answer, but it's kind of screwed up. Because in my eyes, there's no -- a trawl and a longline don't have anything to do one another.

But, anyway, maybe what we could do would be up the incidental take to possibly -- I think Dewey said it was 15 now, and possibly we could move that to 30 rather than giving these guys new permits, or something like that.

1	And one other idea that we came up
2	with and it would help us with permits and who
3	was fishing in the fishery is a one to two
4	year FMP review that would look at and we
5	acknowledged that there were the safe reports
6	is that correct?
7	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.
8	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: and we
9	didn't think they quite did the job and in
10	that review we would like to see the
11	statistics not only that in containment.
12	There's other reports, the permits,
13	active participants, active permits, dormant
14	permits, issues and stock status for the
15	fisheries.
16	And if you guys have anything else?
17	Did I capture it?
18	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
19	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right.
20	Thank you.
21	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Any
22	questions?

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Was that 2 serious question about the [inaudible]? UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. 3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, anytime 4 you have a porridge 5 fish and you've 6 pelagic [inaudible], whether it's squid 7 trawling or trawling for herring, there are swordfish and bluefin tuna feeding in 8 squid and in the herring and so they're caught 9 10 incidentally by the squid vessels herring vessels and you have two 11 discard or you have an incidental catch. 12 13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That was not -- I understand that swordfish eat squid and 14 15 herring and all kinds of things. However, I don't think there's a longline on a squid 16 That was the thing. A longline permit 17 trawl. for a squid trawl. 18 19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think you had comments earlier that you had squid trawls and 20 they were only allowed two fish and that's the 21

reason why they needed a trifecta permits and

1	so [inaudible] discarding swordfish, we don't
2	need to [inaudible]
3	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're saying
4	they're in a fishery. They're in a permitted
5	fishery. Why in the world are we going to
6	give those guys another permit to worry with?
7	Just up their take to something that's
8	reasonable. And if 15 now and they have a
9	problem with that, make it 30. I think we
10	should have that ability. We've got all this
11	quota out there. Let's use it.
12	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually, they
13	don't have trouble with the number. The
14	number was a very generous increase from I
15	believe [inaudible] five to 15, and in the
16	[inaudible] those two to 25 if I'm not
17	mistaken, or close to that, two to 25.
18	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It boils down
19	to you're having a [inaudible] that is
20	required by the regulations.
21	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: First, I'd like
22	to congratulate all the HMS management staff

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

we need a centralized permit, and that not only applied to the HMS permits, but even

Joking aside, we did match up very

transcended that if you had the pie in the sky, it wouldn't just be HMS permits because

one issue that had clear consensus on here was

that we brainwashed you all because we almost

had consistent themes running across all the

charts here. So you're all to be commended.

similarly with what the other folks had.

we do interact with the swordfish fishery or

I mean the squid fishery or the dolphin/wahoo

fishery whether it be a charter permit or

longline permit, and then how those

regulations match up.

So whether that centralized location, the renewing cycle, the dates that you actually need to attain those permits on, or even where you're going to get that information, you have new entrants into the fishery that just need to know what permits do I need, and that could be consolidated on a

website as a potential vehicle.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Having one piece of paper, Joe mentioned similar to the Northeast, you know one paper and it lists everything that you're qualified for. Therefore, when Coast Guard's doing a boarding or instead of having to manager ten pieces of paper that you're getting throughout the entire year, you got your one-stop shopping in hand.

mentioned transcend species or state, again, just trying to consolidate. Keep it simple, stupid. One of the benefits is the service that the Agency provides its constituency would be able to be increased. All of a sudden, I use the example if realized that Gail hadn't sent in her renewal notice for shark and swordfish permits, but I didn't see an accompanying permit, and that's with the assumption that you would still require all three, well, then the Agency [inaudible] just so you know, I got these two, I don't see the third instead of having that

just linger and a year go by before that's actually discovered.

We would be able to consolidate correspondence. You know you could have one letter going out on an annual basis in theory that says, okay, here's the information you need to know. Instead of getting different pieces of paper and when you get the eleventh, you're like, I'm not going to read And so that would also apply to renewal notices, whether it's paper, electronic renewals.

And then I get the last option or benefit there was the service the HMSpermits.gov website provides right now with realtime turnaround in issuing those permits. There isn't a substantial lag of when an application is submitted to the constituent actually receiving the permit in hand. So that was the first issue.

The second issue, we didn't really
-- I think I saw a classification for it, but

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

dealing with limited access and recovered species, the fact that we need a proactive plan in place do so when we cross that threshold that over fishing is no occurring, that we have, okay, steps A, B, and C are going to kick into effect instead of trying to develop them when you're already at that recovery stage, which we're struggling now to some degree with the swordfish. And that ties into how our management comes into play when we're in that rebuilding

versus being rebuilt.

We mentioned the chartering agreement that Rich elaborated on. Perhaps some sort of limited duration could be placed on that in the short term here where we're staring down the barrels at ICAP that's coming November.

I think that we had also heard that you need to balance the effort versus what the quotas are available so we don't repeat those errors of the past where we end up in an

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

overcapitalized situation again in trying to harvest, say, a given quote in compressed time period.

And to touch back on some of the comments you had, Vince. We echoed that. Tt. must be economically attractive for folks to use the permit. And whether that turns into a use or lose pool that if you don't use your permits for, you know, 12 to 18 months, that they go back into circulation, that somebody can have that economic opportunity. maybe we provide that. But it needs to be economically attractive, otherwise, it's just pieces of paper being sold and it's not doing either the U.S. any good in harvesting its quotas or the overall industry.

And I think, also, to touch back on how do you get back to a sustainable level of effort to match the quota is you do very incremental increases or ease of restrictions, that you don't come at it all at once and then realize, well, we just set ourselves

another ten years and here we are, we're right back on the roller coaster ride. That some level of easement into it can help mitigate some of that.

So that's kind of what we had to contribute unless I missed anything. That and Joe's got more permits than I am old.

(Laughter.)

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Brad, thank you very much. We have one more group to hear from.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: -- seems this is what has already been brought up. I think the biggest issue was just dealing with the latent effort. We had a couple of different thoughts on that. As was mentioned in one of the other groups, potentially sort of a reserve category for people that hadn't had landings history for some predetermined time period. They go into a reserve category so that the permit might still have future value at some point down the line, but that these

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

would be people that participants that we wouldn't have to -- that people that are actively involved wouldn't necessarily have to compete with for a given period of time.

As was mentioned I believe in Randy's group, trying to meld the permits a little bit more towards sort of the target species. In this case, if swordfish were the target species, in this case this is the quota that we -- the stock that is essentially rebuilt and something that we're trying to match the landings with with our available quota with and then have endorsements for additional species that one might catch based on their area or based on what their history has been.

Because the situation now where you have the triumvirate that's where the three permits that are worth exponentially more than the sum of their parts, and the issue being that if we really just want to catch swordfish, how would we do that without having

to, you know, within the existing structure and this could be a means to get at that.

And then we had talked about the decision that individuals could make in order to make money doesn't always overlap with what — there's not always this assurance that there is going to be this amount of swordfish for perpetuity. And I think having this reserve category would be sort of a kinder, gentler way to get at some of the issue with the latent effort versus just, hey, you're out of this fishery, you don't have the landings history, sorry you didn't qualify.

And then another suggestion or means of addressing the latent effort would potentially coming up with sort of an optimum yield for number of permits. [Inaudible], you know, the optimum yield for the stock with the number of permits. And, again, in a realtime basis, this would obviously be difficult because people are, you know, cost a lot of money and you're going to have payments that

4 5

you need to make on a boat or whatever for time certain and what if, you know, the optimum yield says your boat isn't going to be included any longer. But I think that's it.

We had a couple of more folks that have stepped out, but is there anything else?

And I think we're in favor of the centralized permit locale as well [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would say that the only other thing that we did touch on at length was the differences between talking about swordfish and shark. Swordfish, you're talking about something that was identified originally at the same time as the shark as being overfished and overfishing occurring that led to the LAPs that got in place in July '99.

With the shark fishery, it is still having issues with multitude of species. It's not a singular species like swordfish, and it has these overfished in some spots, rebuilt in others, and unknown in most. And data poor is

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the biggest problem with the shark fishery. So we felt that there should be some minimum threshold that you should never go below with both with history, particularly with the sharks because it's too easy to ratchet them right on off the landscape right now.

Whereas, the swordfish, you don't want to go much lower. You want to try to get them out there to catch the quota so you don't keep losing it to foreign countries.

But back to the shark, we're sharing those things with Canada, with Mexico, Bahamas, Central America, and stuff like, the high sea fleets, and yet none of those people are on board. We've taken the burden and we're in a situation right now where we're one month of fishing in a year and a half, so we're 50 boats that account for over half the quota roughly speaking. And out of 500 permits, 200-and-something directed and 300 or so that's incidental, the bulk of those people aren't really participating.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

had a feeling that should kind of mechanism be some that eliminated those extra efforts and then got us back down to the visualization that in the had roughly 50 late '80s we boats accomplished most of the catch of 10 million pounds or more a year. Then when the price of fins went up, we wound up having a surge of participation, 200 boats and stuff like that. We were 15 and 20 million, and [inaudible] capture these numbers.

But the reality is that when '93 came along, we're shut down six months out of the year. '94 came alone, we're at a 4,000 pound trip limit, made it а small fishery, and then we go from six million to three million to two million and now we're looking at one million pounds. It's real hard to make a business go with that kind of So since '93, most of these speculation. boats have become multifaceted, other permits, and in those fisheries, grouper, snapper, and

other restrictions like the swordfish closures off of Florida for 12 months out of the year since 2001, all of this has contributed to a situation that these guys are at the mercy of data poor situations, what we considered flawed science that somehow we didn't want to see us totally eliminated.

So we want to take those people, some of them's put their history forward in the original LAP situation, some of it dates back to the early '80s, and those people need to be somehow left on the landscape as the historical participants. But ultimately we eliminated under didn't be want to the circumstances, but we know that we can't keep on having two to 500 people participating in what is technically a 50 boat fishery. So that's to sum up the shark thing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay, thank you. Thank everybody for [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] any comments on Brad's report and I want to make

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	the comment that since he had a similar
2	concern when he talked about easing into the
3	redevelopment, make sure that the [inaudible]
4	was what likely [inaudible] in the future,
5	that is a very rational thought and
6	[inaudible]. I don't have to remind
7	[inaudible] right now. [Inaudible] 27 percent
8	of the quota. It's going to take a long time
9	for the regulatory changes to change to allow
10	some of the offshore fisheries to develop.
11	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So I
12	know I'm between you and your break, but I

don't talk a lot, so it'll be quick.

But I did want to thank you all for showing up here and helping us out on these issues. I've been the regional administrator in Alaska for a number of years and I'm familiar with some of the fisheries problems and some of them are relatively similar to yours.

We have problems with latent effort that we're dealing with. But I don't know

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that we have anything quite as thorny as the shark and swordfish and tuna issues that you've got that we're relying on your advice for. And there aren't any easy answers to this.

We, of compelled, course, are mandated by the Magnuson Act to stop overfishing and that drives a lot of we're doing. So we're anxious to get your advice on that. And I know it's not easy for anyone and we're trying to work with you as much as we can on these issues.

There's а lot of Congressional interest on sharks right now as well. There was a hearing in the House Resources Committee this morning, which I was able to catch part of. They had movies of shark finning and things like that which tend to excite the public and Ι think the interest so continue maintained the and be at Congressional level. So we're going to track that and see where that goes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

For your swordfish and your tuna where the quotas are difficult to achieve for different reasons, those are also you've got. So we're interested in your insight on those. We're working hard in the international arenas. The Tuna Commission, looking forward to the new bluefin tuna assessment to see what we get out of that.

met some of you at the advisory panel a couple of weeks ago, know you're doing double duty many of you on these issues, and while you're doing that, you're not catching a lot of fish. So the bottom line is I appreciate the time you're Look forward to continue to putting in. working with you, work with Margo and Alan. And if you've got something you want to say to me directly, you know my phone number as well, so, please, give me a call. But thanks very much for showing up here and I'll talk to some of you perhaps during the break here, but, otherwise, I'm grateful for the time

1	effort you're putting in. Thanks.
2	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
3	went on break and off the record at 3:15 p.m.
4	and back on the record at 3:30 p.m.)
5	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Welcome
6	back. The sooner we reconvene, the sooner we
7	get out. Okay, folks, we need to get started.
8	Would you take your seats, please? Thank
9	you.
10	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Folks
11	in the back, if you want to keep talking, you
12	can move outside so we can continue in here.
13	MR. McBRIDE: Yes. Joe McBride,
14	FRA, [inaudible] program, whatever I am for
15	the day.
16	Rich, maybe you can help me out
17	with this in the dialogue. At our discussion
18	group, we had doing the math from Vince and
19	from Dewey behind me earlier today, you have
20	approximately 300 boats that could be licensed
21	for the trifecta, for whatever lack of a
22	better term. And according I believe, Vince,

you said offhand 60 boats are actually doing the fishing. There's 40 in [inaudible] that are sitting with a license somewhere that they're talking about putting back in action. That gives you 100 boats.

So there are 200 boats that are capable of getting back into this fishery, which would increase the swordfish landings and they're not coming in. So as a lay person, I'm sort of saying, why not? And the why not from a fisherman's point of view is because it's not economical to do so. And when we're talking about -- now, anything is experimental, anything that helps.

You guys in the business know better than I, that chartering might be a stopgap scenario and we suggested a sunset clause, you know, whether it's a year, two years, to see if it helps, to see if it carries us over. But were can we get those 200 boats back in operation? And am I right in the assumption that they're not in the

fishery, are not going to come in the fishery

because it's not economically feasible?

Anybody know that? I mean I'm just throwing

that out there, somebody with more knowledge

5 than I do.

It seems that 200 boats sitting on the sidelines that could fish for swordfish to for whatever reason don't want to do it. I think I'm right. But I'm calling you, Rich, because second to me, you're omnipotent and I know you --

(Laughter.)

(RICH): Actually, Joe, that was about as well articulated a description of the problem that I've heard. I can't do it any better than that and I don't have the answer. I don't have the big answer, but you hit it on the head. If it's not profitable, it's not going to happen. That's number one.

And there aren't 200 boats around what we're talking about, I think Vince is talking about, is maybe 200 sets of the

permits that are available, or 250 sets of the permits that are available.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] how many actual [inaudible] were out there. [Inaudible] fish.

(RICH): We call them 12-packs in New England. But in any case, you know, we've said for a long time that until -- I mean there's a number of elements that enter into If you're going to redevelop into a fishery the balances having some coastal -resuming some coastal presence, but having also a major focus on a distant water fishery, then we have to change the fishing patterns that the U.S. fleet traditionally operated under. We've been basically a wet boat fleet and we're going to have to convert from a wet boat fleet to a more than a wet boat fleet, a combination freezer, freezer type, and that's Those kind of going to take a long time. things don't happen over night.

And the fishery is going to have to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

become profitable and I'm sure everybody has to be talking about the \$4 a price fuel. I mean it's just a killer and it's going to hurt your charter boat fishery as well. Where are we all going with -- how do you develop a fishery at this point in time when you're up against that and you're up against fleets that are subsidized in their fuel prices.

But the first thing you do is you need to get regulations that are in the way out of the way to the extent that you can. We're hoping on the GRT that would be hoping We're for modification on t.he boundaries as research proves that you can -elimination of closed not areas, but modification of the boundaries when you can show that mandatory circle hooks and safety and release practices can substitute closed areas and still have acceptable levels of bycatch. So it's going to be a process.

MR. WHITAKER: Well, Joe's pretty

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

much covered exactly what I was going to say.

I mean fishermen are pretty smart guys. have to be now to survive. But until these guys that are longline and swordfish now start coming back to the dock with some catches that reflect the stock assessment, which is supposedly great, then I don't care how many permits you got out there, ain't nobody going to do it.

But by the same token, I, as well as everybody in this room, don't want to lose any swordfish quota to anybody and I there was some means we could keep it other than giving it up. But I find it hard to believe how other boats can come here and profitably catch swordfish when we can't do it And maybe somebody can answer ourselves. I don't know if they're catching them in the high seas and landing them -- planning on catching them in the high seas and landing them in the U.S, or catching them in our EEZ. And maybe somebody can answer that for me.

Thank you.

MS. BEIDEMAN: I'm Terri Beideman.

I don't have an answer for you, Rom.

But one of the other issues is if you were contemplating getting into a fishery that's going to be reducing quota by giving it away, you're hard pressed to get people to want to invest into a fishery brand new. You know, the old people, some of those people are scallopers. You can't really blame them for going scalloping instead of going to the Grand Banks for boo-koo dollars, seasonal.

But there's a variety of reasons, but one of them has to be that if I were going to be buying or building a boat to get into a fishery, I'd want to be sure that two years, three years down the road, I'm still going to have a quota to catch. So, you know, it's all kind of intermingled. So that's it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: On tomorrow's agenda, we moved it from today, is the issue of greenstick gear, which we're very

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

interested in, because we see it as a way of reducing pelagic longline bycatch of marlin.

In the tuna fishery, not in the swordfish fishery, but as we're talking permits, I hope that that discussion is not completely excluded from permit considerations. Ι mean it's certainly something you're looking beyond. I mean if we're going to expand permits and look at all sorts of ways, even in the tuna fishery, we need to be mindful of new ways also to reduce the bycatch of important bycatch species.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And just wanted to add that anybody that was on the U.S. delegation the last two years both in Croatia and in Turkey heard Bill Hogarth, as chairman of ICAT and as head of the U.S. delegation, publicly state that his agency went too far in killing this industry, and those were public statements that he made.

And my view is the first obligation is the people that you killed. You give them

1	an opportunity to come back first. And then
2	there's those that survived. And those are
3	the ones that I'm hearing from, going to hear
4	from loudly on issues like chartering and
5	leasing who are going to say, what's in it for
6	me; I've suffered now since 1997; we haven't
7	caught our quota; I've done my share; what's
8	in it for me; I did everything you asked me to
9	do and now I don't have a profitable fishery;
10	I'm faced with extinction with \$4 gallon fuel
11	and \$3 imports; help me; I did what you asked
12	me to do.

MR. MONTELLA: Vince Montella. Ι think market instability is the biggest I mean you have a fishery that's reason. thriving. You've got an excess of permits, and it doesn't make sense why nobody wants to And I think it boils back down to do it. things we talked about last time here with imports.

I think we really need to look at what we're doing to our fishermen.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we're allowing fishermen to come here. And, like I said, I know the in the MSA there's provision there for other countries that aren't complying the same as we are, that we can stop imports into this country.

Fishermen need a stable market in order to go fishing. You can't leave a dock, and on a normal trip, a small boat, 50-foot boat, \$20,000 to \$30,000 to go fishing. When you come back in, your 8,000 pounds of fish could be \$40,000 or it could be \$15,000.

It's risky. You can't get crew any more. I mean how many trips are you going to make in a row losing money. It only take a few trips before you scratch your head and say, yes, scalloping looks better, something looks better.

But market instability, from a fisherman's perspective, is the reason nobody wants to -- there's no new recruitment into this industry and we really need to look at that. We need to look at protecting our

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

domestic fishermen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I want to echo a little bit on what Vinny said there. It doesn't take too much when you think about it about the imports, about crews, about how much it costs to go fishing nowadays, the amount of gear. You would be total crazy, somebody go rig up a longline boat to fishing in the U.S. right now when you go look at the amount of just everything [inaudible], just the whole across the board to do that to load that boat up.

You know, we're looking at here how to go catch our quota and how to make it more profitable for the U.S. fisherman and at the same time save our quota. Well, one, how about the imports? Why are we still importing swordfish in from other countries into here? If the incentive is that we got to put a spark under our fishermen's -- a fire under their to go fishing, or whatever, then you give them incentive and maybe need to

[inaudible] the import thing coming in here no more.

I mean it's not there no more. We beat everybody down so much, and the last one, the few that around, you know, it's kind of the last buffalo out there. A crowd always likes to say, you know, about catching the last swordfish, catching the last buffalo, well, and I just don't see it. Maybe we should just seriously look at other options at chartering some high seas boats, or whatever the scenario is, go catch some poundage.

I mean this is way too little. It's too little way too late. It just hacks me off that our Agency that's in charge of this did not have the foresight to see this coming down the pike since 1997. They should be ashamed of themselves. And we're sitting here worrying about this in the last hour. We're going to lose quota. I don't know how much. It depends on the scenario. But it's just you're sitting around here dicking around

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

with a few permits and everything, worrying about trifectas and stuff, and it ain't going to put no more poundage. Our Agency really needs a re-evaluation of who's in charge and do they want anybody around here eating U.S. swordfish.

MR. CODDINGTON: Yes, Ron Coddington. And real quick, you know I'm a recreational representative. One thing that amazes me is how you commercial fishermen even business plan. I've watched fuel do increases in my business go up 76 percent in the last 12 months. And I look at the price of swordfish and it appears to be the same price that it was as long ago as I can look. Ten years ago it was the same price.

One of the things I would suggest, because it appears that the industry can't grab this idea and maybe NHMS needs to help them, we've talked about marketing. And I realize market instability has a lot more to do with just marketing. We've got problems

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with imports that we need to deal with.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But I recognize that the gentleman sitting next to me has created a niche market with his fresh day caught fish and this man never has a problem getting his top dollar for fish because the little bit of marketing he's done. You have another group called Day Boats, Inc. or Day Boats, LLC that's marketing day caught fish.

And I'm not saying that the longline industry needs to be marketing caught because that's not what you have. fresh caught U.S. fish, I know one thing that as another businessman, if I go into market and have a choice of buying U.S. swordfish and Costa Rican caught swordfish, I'm going to buy if it was caught by you guys every time. But I don't know there's very few restaurants that even tell -- restaurants that tell me where it is or grocery stores or fish houses that tell me where that swordfish came from.

1	It looks like we need NHMS help
2	similar to what I saw happen in the wild
3	shrimp caught marketing that's happened, and I
4	don't know if industry was involved. But
5	we've talked about this at several AP meetings
6	and, apparently, there isn't a part of your
7	industry that can grab that ball easily right
8	now and run with it. Maybe NHMS needs to do
9	it and help these guys. Because if we
10	marketed these fish properly, I guarantee
11	people would buy U.S. swordfish before they'd
12	buy foreign-caught swordfish.
13	So that's one of my suggestions,
14	that somebody needs to help bring this
15	together, the marketing issue together, and

s, is together, the marketing issue together, and let's market these fish the right way.

(MARGO): Yes, actually, Partnerships in Communications, John Ward, has met a couple of times with industry on what the government can do to facilitate marketing. We can't do it all. There's definitely an industry lead there, but there are certain

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

16

17

18

19

20

21

things that the government can help with and I
think they're working on that. So it's
underway.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Margo, could you explain? I haven't been privy to any of the earlier discussions. But we've heard several groups raise the chartering issue so that we could get some tons, you know, landed and credited to the U.S. so we don't lose our quota. What is the problem? Can we move forward with that, or are there problems and what are they?

(MARGO): Well, the status is that there are a number of statutes that affect whether foreign vessels can come into the U.S. EEZ, Magnuson being primary, and we have not established any TALFF, which is the total allowable level of foreign fishing. So foreign vessels cannot come into the U.S. EEZ.

There's also Nicholson Act and Mitchell Act that require U.S. boats to built, vessels to built in the U.S., and also

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

prevents foreign vessels from offloading in the U.S. The chartering recommendation is an ICAT recommendation that would allow for boats flagged to one country to fish under another country's quota. It's not specific. It's not a limitation. It's kind of an open-ended, anybody can do it.

But when went through we rulemaking, we have in our own regs, in the 635 regs, one clause that says under no such circumstances shall any chartering arrangement be counted against U.S. quota. And that is something that we implemented. And I think at the time we didn't envision a scenario given the suite of other statutes that, perhaps, a Canadian vessel fishing on the high seas, offloading in a Canadian port, might be able to meet the terms of the ICAT recommendation. Because you have to be able to supervise the offload and all of that. But that's It didn't occur to us possibility I think. and so given the suites of statutes out there

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	included that statement. But that is on our
2	own 635 reg. So I think it is something that
3	we consider. It's something that I've tried
4	to bring up, both at the ISC meeting a couple
5	of times and the APL, where there are other
6	issues with that.
7	Does the United States care whether
8	Canada fishes our quota or not? I haven't
9	gotten a lot of response. I have gotten a
10	repeated industry request.
11	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And you
12	focused on whether foreign vessels could come
13	into U.S. waters under those
14	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no.
15	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I know. But
16	I mean her response on legislation was that
17	I'm saying on high seas it is that one last
18	clause which you referenced, is that the one
19	holdup for high seas?
20	(MARGO): Our 635 regs are what are
21	in the way at this point.
22	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm looking

here at what I want to talk about. Back to what Ron was talking about.

With regards to marketing, in Florida, what we do is a portion of commercial licensing fees, the money that is paid for commercial licensing, a portion of that goes to our Department of Agriculture and Services, and that is earmarked Consumer specifically for marketing. So while NHMS may not necessarily be the right agency to help with this issue, there may be another agency in a similar as it is in Florida to be able to assist us with seafood marketing and that kind of thing. And it may be that a portion of permits, you know, monies that are charged for permits specific to certain fisheries or maybe even in general can be applied for doing marketing.

MS. STEPHAN: Thank you, Paul. I'm Dianne Stephan. I'm with the HMS division up in Gloucester and I'd also like to introduce my colleage, LeAnn Southward Hogan, who's been

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

participating in the development of this proposed rule. So I'll be reviewing the contents of the proposed rule to modify permitting and reporting requirements of the HMS International Trade Permit Program, which published on Friday, April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

The purpose of the rulemaking is to adjust the international trade program, and I'll be abbreviating that as ITP, based on lessons learned since it was first implemented in 2005; to implement ICAT recommendation 07-10, which is Atlantic bluefin tuna catch documentation program; increase and to understanding improve enforcement and and administration associated with the shark fin trade. These regulatory adjustment are all proposed under the authority of the Magnuson-Fishery Conservation and Management Act and the Atlantic Tuna Convention Act.

A bit of background. The HMS international trade permit was implement in 2005 for businesses that imported, exported or

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

re-exported the following HMS species: bluefin
tuna, including Atlantic/Pacific and southern
bluefin tuna; swordfish; and frozen bigeye
tuna. International trade tracking programs,

which are also called statistical document or

consignment document programs, are in effect

7 for each of these species.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

For ICAT, a bluefin tuna, swordfish and frozen bigeye tuna program is in effect. Under the IntraAmerican Tropical Commission, there is a frozen bigeye Indian Ocean Tuna Commission The program. also has a frozen bigeye tuna program. then the Commission for the Conservation of Seven Bluefin Tuna has a southern bluefin The U.S. is a member of ICAT and program. IATTC and implements the CCFDT program and the IOTC program to assist implementation ICAT's bluefin tuna program.

The trade tracking programs that are in effect for each of these species occur at least statistical document programs. The

programs require that a statistical document travel with every export and serve as a type

of passport for the consignment.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The statistical document includes information about the consignment, including the contents, vessel's catch, and exporter information. Countries that are participating in the program collect and tally the import data for review by the relevant international organization and exporting countries.

Α catch document program is bluefin proposed for tuna. Ιt has been adopted by ICAT and is proposed in this rulemaking. The catch document programs expand on the function of statistical document programs.

of statistical The purposes document programs understand are to international market and its impact on fisheries and fish stocks, to monitor trade, better understand trade, and prevent introduction of illegally caught product into

the international market, and to serve as a proxy for catch in certain situations such as when nations have insufficient financial means to track their own catch. A catch document includes these trade tracking functions and then adds onto the specific purpose of monitoring catch.

I'm going to talk about the BCD program, which is the bluefin catch document program, which is adopted by ICAT a little bit later in the presentation when I get into the alternatives.

So the proposed rule is divided up to make it easier to follow and understand three different permitting, areas: reporting, regulatory structure and and clarification. There's three issues each topic for a total of nine issues. this rule is not expected to result in any impacts to the environment, the analysis was limited economic analysis to an alternatives in each of these topic areas.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Ιf you're interested in further information on that, I'd be happy to provide you with a copy of the RAR and the IRFA.

First, under permitting, the proposed rule would clarify that when foreign importer is bringing product into the United States, its resident agent or corporate surety provider, often known as the bond holder, is responsible for obtaining the ITP and complying with the associated reporting requirements.

The status action quo, no alternative would specify who is not responsible for obtaining the permit in this type of a situation and it has resulted in confusion when foreign entities apply for permits in the past.

The second issue under permitting the proposed rule would require that which applicants for ITPs, are currently issued out of the southeast region, submit their application at least 30 days prior to

when they would like to have it effective.

And the proposed rule would also remove the requirement that the permit be issued within

This is consistent with other southeast region permit regulations. They attempt to make sure to use every effort to issue the permit within 30 days. The status quo, no action alternative would maintain the current regulations and would continue to require that permits are issued within 30 days.

The last issue under permitting deals with permitting of shark fin traders. A little bit of background. The shark fin exporter market drives the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico shark fisheries and overfishing of several species and many of prohibited species can be attributed to the high product value of shark fins. There is also a U.S. market for shark fin products, which are both imported and re-exported.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

30 days.

The proposed rule would require that shark fin traders obtain the HMS ITP, permitting that these individuals would assist us in a number of ways. It would help NHMS to better under the commerce of the commodity, to provide information about sharks and traders, and also to provide access to existing records for enforcement purposes. There would not be any reporting requirements associated with this, and the current cost of the permit is

NHMS has estimated the number of shark fin traders nationwide at about 100. We know of approximately 40 importers. The status quo, no action alternative would not require shark traders to obtain an ITP.

\$25 and we anticipate that that cost would

Under the issue of reporting, the proposed rule would adjust reporting requirements for ITP holders and Atlantic bluefin tuna dealer permit holders to require reporting via received by date rather than a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

continue.

postmarked date.. For example, biweekly reports would be required to be received within 10 days after the reporting period ends rather than postmarked by 10 days after the reporting period ends.

This has also been proposed some other HMS associated fisheries amendment two to the consolidated HMS FMP and would clarify regulations when reports submitted other than by mail, for example, if they're submitted electronically or delivered The status action person. quo, no alternative would maintain the requirement that reports are postmarked by 10 days after the reporting period ends.

The proposed rule would replace the ICAT bluefin tuna statistical document program with the ICAT bluefin tuna catch document program, which was adopted as recommendation 07-10 at the November 2007 ICAT meeting in Turkey. Earlier we talked about the purposes of a catch documentation program. This

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

program could specifically be considered to be implement to better track the catch of the eastern bluefin tuna in the Mediterranean and to monitor Mediterranean bluefin tuna farming operations.

The United States already has a sophisticated catch monitoring program in place, which includes dealer reporting and tagging of each bluefin tuna purchased from a vessel. Because of this program, the U.S. is exempt from some of the provisions of the BCD program. However, there will still be several modifications to the trade tracking portion of the bluefin tuna program.

For imports, the new BCD form will replace the current statistical document form.

The form fields, which the importer is responsible for filling out, are the same as those on the statistical document form. It will just be a matter of basically getting used to a new form.

All of the re-exports from the U.S.

will now require a re-export certificate.

Previously, re-exports which were not modified from the imported consignment, could be re-exported without a re-export certificate by simply filling out the intermediate importer certification section of the form. These fields have all been removed in the new catch document and a re-export certificate will now be required for all re-exports.

And then thirdly under imports, the re-exports of untagged bluefin tuna, for example, catch originating from any nation except Canada or the United States, will be reported to the importing required to be nation and the ICAT secretariat. re-exporter will have to send the catch attachments documents and any to these entities at addresses that will be provided by NHMS.

For exports, a new bluefin tuna catch document will replace the current statistical document program. The catch for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

each vessel will now be required to be listed on a separate BCD. Whereas, in the past, we were able to combine catches from several vessels on a statistical document. And we're still determining whether NHMS will provide hard copies of the catch document as it currently does for the statistical document program, or whether we'll be providing the form electronically, and we'd particularly like your input on this issue.

onto the last Moving issue on reporting, which involves the clarification of the regulations that would allow bluefin tuna exporters who concurrently hold an HMS ITP --It involves the clarification of excuse me. the regulations that would allow bluefin tuna exporters to collaborate with HMS ITP holders -- sorry, I'm just getting wrapped around the axle on this one paragraph. Okay, I got it. It involves the clarification of regs that allow bluefin tuna exporters who hold an ITP to collaborate with the Atlantic tuna's dealer

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I was having trouble just

With an example, in the instance

In the instance when an Atlantic

permit

holder,

permit holder who purchases the bluefin from

saying that, so let me see if I can explain it

when an individual holds both an Atlantic

tuna's dealer permit and an international

trade permit, the dealer would now only be

tuna's dealer permit transfers a bluefin to an

Atlantic tuna's dealer permit holder would be

required to submit a biweekly report and the

international trade permit holder would be

exempt from the biweekly reporting except that

they would have to maintain a copy of that

report that was submitted by the Atlantic

required to submit one biweekly.

international trader

tuna's dealer permit holder.

vessel to collectively submit only

biweekly report.

a little bit more.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

\_ (

21

22

I hope that was clear this time.

The status quo, no action

alternative would require that both of these permit holders submit separate biweekly reports even in the case when both permits are held by one person.

The first issue under regulatory structure and clarification includes adoption of the definition of import that was included in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2006. proposed rule would adopt the statutory definition of import and include a modification so it does not result changes to the way the program is currently implemented under the ITP.

The second issue under regulatory structure and clarification would update the harmonized tariff schedule codes of swordfish, which we recently changed. NHMS looked at several alternatives to avoid future rulemakings and any cases when HTS codes were changed and determined that for the time being the clearest way to address this issue is to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

continue to include the HTS codes 1 in 2 regulations and update them when necessary with the rulemaking.

> And then the final issue in the rule would clarify reporting proposed responsibilities. The proposed rule would clarify that individuals who are required to, but fail to obtain an international trade permit are still responsible for fulfilling reporting requirements. No status quo, no action alternative would not provide that clarification.

> The public comment period for this proposed rule ends on May 5<sup>th</sup>. We have five public hearings schedule beginning April 23rd in Santa Rosa, California; the 24<sup>th</sup> in Long Beach, California; the 25<sup>th</sup> in Gloucester, Massachusetts; the 28<sup>th</sup> in Miami; and the 29<sup>th</sup> in Panama City, Florida.

> The preferred method for submitting your comments is through the federal e-role making portal, which the web address is listed

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

\_\_\_

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

here and the document ID is listed below that.

And that site has a good search engine, so

you shouldn't have any trouble finding it if

you don't remember the document ID number.

And then also just as a look ahead to some issues that might be affecting us, those of us who are involved in international trade programs for HMS. NHMS is currently implementing the international trade data system, which includes collecting import data through a centralized electronic portal.

Use of this system was required by the Safe Ports Act of 2006 and NHMS has a deadline of implementing the one port hole system for collecting import data towards the end of 2009. So we're working hard on developing the kind of data structure and determining what kind of deals would be involved in implementation of the ITDS.

We expect that an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking will be coming out sometime before the end of May, and then there

1	will be a rulemaking associated with
2	incorporation of the ITDS. So it looks like
3	actually a really good opportunity for us to
4	collaborate further with the other agencies
5	that are involved in collecting import data
6	and for us to be able to move forward in
7	getting all this information electronically
8	and accessible online. So, although it's a
9	big system, it looks like it'll have a lot of
10	positive opportunities.
11	So with that, any questions?
12	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: More of a
13	question. This reporting, electronic
14	reporting for ports of entry, is this for over
15	the road stuff or is this strictly ports,
16	marine ports of entry? I'm a little confused,
17	so I'll have to talk to you about this.
18	MS. STEPHAN: Are you talking about
19	the catch documentation, or the international
20	trade data system?
21	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, they

seem to kind of go together. So I'm not sure

1	how they mesh and I'm not you know, it has
2	practical applications for me, so I'm not sure
3	what this all means.
4	MS. STEPHAN: Okay. Well, if you
5	come back to some more specific questions,
6	other folks might want to hear the answer,
7	too.
8	MR. HUDSON: Rusty Hudson, Directed
9	Shark Fisheries. I've got just a couple of
10	questions.
11	This starts with why no reporting
12	for shark fin traders, just permitting? And
13	is the compelling \$25 for buying the permit,
14	is that importers and exporters?
15	You mentioned that you were going
16	to get them to give up what's considered
17	confidential business records, a picture of
18	the past. How far back into the past? How
19	species specific?
20	And, you know, let's just sort of
21	start with that. That's kind of where my
22	mind's at on this.

MS. STEPHAN: The permit would be proposed rule. The proposed rule in the proposes that the permit would be required for importers and exporters. There is reporting because we're looking at this as a first step and we had to balance limited staff resources with what we were trying to get out of it, and so this is our first step is to put permit in place.

And as far as going back to historical information, I noticed that in the slide. It's not the intent to try to dig out historical information. I think that probably needs to be reworded. It would just be current records.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So when you say current, [tape went silent].

I'm sorry. The Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico sharks, you know there's only about maybe a dozen people that are first line or second line receivers of that product. In the permitting network, and that's what they

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

call it, a network, it goes from the boat to a
fish house, from a fish house to a fin dealer,
fin dealer to the fin company whether it's in
a location like Miami or California or even
Hong Kong, and it just perplexes me. How long
do you figure it's going to take before you
actually require reporting?
MS. STEPHAN: We currently don't
have any plans to require reporting.
MS. BEIDEMAN: Terri Beideman.
Thanks, Dianne, for the [inaudible]. My eyes
Thanks, Dianne, for the [inaudible]. My eyes are glazing over with all the acronyms, brand
are glazing over with all the acronyms, brand
are glazing over with all the acronyms, brand new ones, stuff I don't know. What is HTS?
are glazing over with all the acronyms, brand new ones, stuff I don't know. What is HTS?  MS. STEPHAN: HTS stands for
are glazing over with all the acronyms, brand new ones, stuff I don't know. What is HTS?  MS. STEPHAN: HTS stands for harmonized tariff schedule and it's the
are glazing over with all the acronyms, brand new ones, stuff I don't know. What is HTS?  MS. STEPHAN: HTS stands for harmonized tariff schedule and it's the numbers that refer to by which products are
are glazing over with all the acronyms, brand new ones, stuff I don't know. What is HTS?  MS. STEPHAN: HTS stands for harmonized tariff schedule and it's the numbers that refer to by which products are categorized when they're imported so that
are glazing over with all the acronyms, brand new ones, stuff I don't know. What is HTS?  MS. STEPHAN: HTS stands for harmonized tariff schedule and it's the numbers that refer to by which products are categorized when they're imported so that customs folks know how to assign the tariff

filets of a particular species.

1	(RICH): Dianne, I can't see you,
2	but it's Rich back here.
3	I notice you're going to have a
4	Pacific public hearing. But when I was
5	looking under the species, you don't have
6	Mexican bluefin tuna or Japanese, which is
7	Northern Pacific bluefin tuna, right? There's
8	a reason for that?
9	MS. STEPHAN: I'm not sure which
10	slide you're looking at.
11	(RICH): I'm looking at background,
12	the first one.
13	MS. STEPHAN: They are included in
14	the current bluefin tuna statistical document
15	program and we would continue to be including
16	them under the catch document program, and
17	that's the reason we're having the West Coast
18	hearings.
19	(RICH): Okay. And did I hear you
20	say jumping to the ICAT bluefin tuna catch
21	document that all re-exports from U.S. will
22	require a re-export certificate? But then did

1	I hear you mention an exemption for Canadian
2	Fish? Or did I miss that?
3	MS. STEPHAN: It's confusing. All
4	re-exports in the U.S. will require a
5	re-export certificate. What I said that had
6	to do with Canadian/U.S. fish is that
7	re-exports of untagged fish, and that would be
8	U.S. and Canada are the only countries with
9	tagging programs in place. So re-exports of
10	untagged fish would require that the
11	re-exporter send the catch document ahead of
12	the re-export to the ICAT secretariat and the
13	confident authority of the importing nation.
14	(RICH): So it's not really an
15	exemption. I'm a little confused by how that
16	actually is going to work out.
17	So all the other countries that
18	import bluefin to the United States untagged,
19	the burden then falls upon U.S. dealers to
20	report that catch and export to the ICAT
21	secretariat and to NHMS?
22	MS. STEPHAN: What was the first

thing	you	said,	Rich?
JJ	1 0 0	~ ,	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'm still under (RICH): Okay. that same proposed rule, ICAT bluefin tuna catch document, and on the third bullet under imports it says, re-exports of untagged bluefin must be reported to the importing nation and ICAT secretariat. And it's only the Canadian and the U.S. that have immediate, you have to put a tag in the tail of the tuna as soon as you catch it, so every place else in the Pacific and the Atlantic is not doing it.

If the fish comes into the United States, the burden falls upon the U.S. exporter to report to the importing nation, to where you're sending it to, and to the ICAT secretariat.

MS. STEPHAN: That's right, Rich.

(RICH): They're going to be real happy with that. I don't think they're going to be real happy with that.

And if I could procedurally, this

1	came out in the Federal Register and I just
2	missed it. When was that, a month ago or
3	something?
4	MS. STEPHAN: No, April 4 <sup>th</sup> .
5	(RICH): April 4 <sup>th</sup> , today? And the
6	comment period ends May 5 <sup>th</sup> ? Was this mailed
7	to U.S. dealer permit holders?
8	MS. STEPHAN: Yes, it was.
9	(RICH): Good move. Okay. I'd
LO	have a few more public hearings than you're
L1	planning on right now and I'd extend the
L2	comment period. My suggestion.
L3	MS. STEPHAN: We're required to
L4	have ICAT recommendations implement and
15	effective by July.
L6	(RICH): By July.
L7	MS. STEPHAN: That's part of the
L8	timing.
L9	(RICH): It just seems a little
20	unreasonable to ask to force upon the U.S.
21	dealers who already have to deal with the
22	statistical document, or now the catch

document, for all U.S. caught fish and properly tagged fish to then for those nations that aren't bothering to tag and track their catches, the burden falls upon U.S. dealers. If I was a dealer, I'd say what's up with that.

MS. STEPHAN: Just one additional note to that specific point, Rich, is that they will be able to report that information electronically, so it's going to end up hopefully being fairly easy and just forwarding of a PDF form.

(RICH): I'm glad you have to explain it and not me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This is a comment of concern. Unforunately, Sonja and Dr. Hueter are no longer here, but certainly many of us defer to them on conservation. But some species being so seriously overfished, and I assume there's potential for mis-identification, doesn't it logical and cautionary for the seem more

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Agency to put forth the effort to require
2	these traders to have permits? I mean start
3	off on the best foot rather than going to them
4	later and trying to figure out who's doing it.
5	I mean you have 40 importers you
6	said and 100 traders, but you said you would
7	not, if I understood correctly, be requiring
8	any permits on the traders, right?
9	MS. STEPHAN: No. We're using
10	trader as a term to cover import, exporter,
11	and re-exporter.
12	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
13	Importer, exporter or re-exporter, so we're
14	just using trader meaning in a general sense.
15	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. I
16	thought it was, okay.
17	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
18	Sorry. One note of clarification. On the
19	handouts, at the bottom of the last page, the
20	document ID number is different from what was
21	on the screen. So it reads 06488U88. That's
22	an easier way to find this document on

regs.gov than what was on the screen. So just FYI. It's on the handout. The handout is the easier way to use it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. We're going to move right into the next presentation. I know you all are looking to get up and get out of here. So we're going to do this one rather quickly.

We're going to introduce you to some of the issues that we have with the Caribbean fisheries and some of the things that Russell and I have found out and Margo one some recent trips down to speak to fishermen and the council and the territorial government. So, jumping right in.

NHMS recognizes that there are real between differences of some segments the Caribbean fishery and the fisheries that occur off the mainland U.S. and that these differences can create an awkward fit between the regulations and Caribbean fisheries.

Some of these main differences are

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

small vessels. These vessels are generally around 25 feet. Short trips, they're mostly all day boats. Generally limited profit margins, these folks don't make very much money. And there's a high local consumption of the catches.

This awkward fit can be seen in examination of the existing permits held in the U.S./Caribbean which totals zero. For limited access vessel permits, we have zero shark, zero sword, and zero tunas longline permits in the Caribbean. That's by people who are actually living in the Caribbean.

Our open access permits, you can see we have approximately 150 charter head boat and general category permits. So that sort of the universe of people who are allowed to fish for and sell tunas.

Puerto Rico, obviously the angling permit looks very high over there, but it's our understanding there's approximately 60,000 vessels in Puerto Rico. So angling category

1	there's 773 in Puerto Rico.
2	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]
3	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No,
4	there's 60,000 recreational vessels in Puerto
5	Rico.
6	For dealer permits, you can see we
7	have only nine. So if you're going to fish
8	tunas in the Caribbean or any HMS, you have
9	approximately nine dealers that you can sell
10	to. And it's my understanding that most of
11	these dealers are individuals who also have
12	permits who merely buy from themselves and
13	then to do the legal way and then sell onto
14	hotels or other restaurants.
15	You want to compare that to the
16	mainland, we have approximately 659 dealers
17	here on the East Coast and the Gulf.
18	This is the latest landings data
19	that we have. This is from the 2007 national
20	report. This sort of contrasts the Caribbean
21	landings with the total U.S. What I want you

to know is that the majority of these landings

are pelagic longline landings from vessels that are not based in the Caribbean. These are mainland vessels who have listed on their landings forms that the statistical area that

they were fishing in was the Caribbean.

that I would assume are likely from Caribbean vessels, we'd look for handline or rod and reel, and we have for yellow fin tuna approximately eight metric tons; for skipjack ten metric tons of handline and eight metric tons on rod and reel; and for the albacore we have approximately 0.4 meter tons. So not a whole lot of it is likely from these small vessels. And absolutely zero of the sword reported.

So the known problems. Unpermitted fishing vessels and dealers result in this whole laundry list here. Increased risk of regulatory violations. Limited data in reporting, which is one of our main worries. Underestimates of size and value of Caribbean

landings. A disadvantage to the U.S./Caribbean if domestic regional allocations are made. Underestimates of U.S. landings during international negotiations. Limited availability to fulfill international reporting obligations. And increased uncertainty in stock assessments and management decisions.

Additionally, unpermitted fishing also places U.S. fishermen in jeopardy of being participants in an IUU fishery. That would trigger obligations for us to halt the IUU fishing. The bottom line is that it hurts everyone who lives and works there and many of the people who live and work up here in the mainland.

So to address the permitting, reporting, and other issues, we intend to develop a plan amendment for the Caribbean. We will ID specific barriers, develop ways to address unique issues, and examine ways to modify existing management measures to better

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fit the needs of the U.S./Caribbean.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Looking forward. We're looking at about 18 to 24 months to complete the process. As I said earlier, Margo and Russ went down and spoke with the Caribbean council in December of 2007, and Russ and I just finished a series of prescoping meetings in Puerto Rico, St. Thomas, and St. Croix. We were down there in March. Obviously, we're here, going to discuss with the AP today.

After leave here, we'll be together putting an issues and document and heading out to conduct a formal scoping process. We hope to do that in I would think approximately September of And after that we'll publish a draft EIS and a proposed rule. I think our target date time for that would be summer of '09. Obviously, we'll have public hearings along with the proposed rule, and then look to publish a final IES in winter of 2010.

Through the council and prescoping

1 meetings, we've tried to identify appropriate 2 to help us resolve some of partners the Caribbean issues. We've identified and met 3 Caribbean Fisheries 4 with the Management Council, the Puerto Rico DNR, the U.S. Virgin 5

Islands Department of Fish and Wildlife, and

7 several local fishing organizations.

I have four slides here that are going to just sort of bulletize some of the main points raised by the different groups of people we sat with.

The first slide are issues raised by the council and they had sort of three main gripes: first being dealer permits; second being use of FAD; and third, sales of HMS; and four, some of the outreach they want us to conduct.

First off is their concern over a lack of dealer permits and they know that the fishermen who are legally permitted don't have anybody to sell to and they wanted to know if the fishermen should hold individual dealer

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

permits. So that's on their radar.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

They also wanted us to know that there's a series of FADs deployed in the USVI and that the DFW plans to deploy more. That wasn't something that we really knew a whole lot about, at least I didn't, and the Caribbean council seemed to be -- wanted us to know about it.

Additionally, sales of HMS, there's concern over sales of tunas by fishermen holding the territorial not commercial fishing permits in the USVI. they have very limited markets and, say, when a charter head boat comes in and sells his catch, he can flood the market and take away the sales that the day commercial fishermen would normally have had. So they wanted us to look at changing our regs to not allow charter head boat and general category guys to be able they had the territorial sell unless commercial fishing permit, but I think they can probably do that themselves with their own

regulations and require that vessels selling fish have to have that permit.

For outreach, they requested Spanish translation, but said that we should only do that for summary documents. That they didn't think that we needed to translate an 800 page EIS into Spanish. So that's good for us.

They also wanted us to work with the NHMS Caribbean field station, fishing magazines, and radio stations to announce dates locations. hearing and They're concerned that we'll have very little turnout unless we really spend a lot of time doing outreach, and, actually, they recommended that we scare them into coming. I don't know if we can do that, but I'll try.

Obviously, after we finished the process, they requested that any new regulatory brochures we create be translated and distributed at tournaments, boat ramps, cleaning stations, and tackle shops. We'll

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

work with our news partners down there to do that when that time comes.

So our prescoping meeting in Puerto Rico, one of the first things they told us was that the Puerto Rico fisheries data collection is very limited and that large correction factors are applied. I don't think they get very good data down there. They're aware of it. They're working to change that.

They also recommended that we draft a memorandum of understanding with the government to acknowledge the need for the HMS data collection. Basically, to get any data out of there, we're going to need the Puerto Rican government's cooperation.

Obviously, they're concerned about few permitted HMS dealers. Once again, they asked the question should individual commercial fishermen hold their own dealer permits so they can buy from themselves and then turn around and sell. As it is, fish are being sold directly from the vessels or at

roadside stands. They're not going through HMS dealers. They're not making it into the dealer reporting process.

They also recommended that NHMS translate and distribute a summary of the DEIS and not a full document.

In St. Thomas, there was interest in a combined HMS harvest and dealer permit. The fishermen there, the way they operate right now is they get a harvest and sales permit. They're allowed to sell and they'd like to see an HMS permit that would allow them to catch HMS sharks, tunas and sword and sell them as well.

The St. Thomas DFW said that they could modify their commercial catch report to collect the HMS catch and that they would then send summary reports to us. As it is right now, the fishermen send catch reports to the DFW and then they compile it. They have very little information on HMS on their forms, but they said they'd be willing to expand that

and do that data collection for us. So we wouldn't actually have to get it from the fishermen, we could actually just get it from the territorial government.

One thing that the fishermen wanted us to know is that they're not fishing big gears, that they're using handlines or the dominant gear type. But that they also possess fish traps and gill nets and several other things on the same sort of trips and that would be kind of funky with our regs as we don't allow non-authorized gears on trips where they're harvesting, say, tunas and have fish traps on board. That would be bad.

They also acknowledge the dealer permit problem and said that the fish are being sold directly from the harvesters to hotels and restaurants. They're not going through dealers. They're going straight from the boat into coolers and straight to hotels.

They also wanted us to know that their vessels average about 25 feet. They're

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

wood, outboard vessels, and they said that 37 foot was the maximum in their fleet right now.

They also said that FADs were important to them and that they had eight deployed and that they planned to do 24 in the next year or two. I don't if that's changed recently, but they really rely on the FADs.

In St. Croix, we got much of the same comments. They were interest in the HMS harvest/dealer permit. And DFW St. Croix said that they'd be willing to participate in HMS data collection and help us get landings data. They basically have a FAD tuna fishery there with very limited swordfish. One of the handliners who was there said that he had taken I think two swordfish in 15 years.

And they mostly fish handlines and their style of float gear for yellow fin tuna. That's their primary target of HMS, along with dorado and other types. But that they also possess traps and gill nets on their boats.

They said that their fleet is a trailer fishery. They're not even keeping their boats in the water. They're keeping them on land and that they range from 24 to 26 feet.

They also acknowledged that the dealer permit was a problem. They don't have anyone to sell to except directly to the users, the hotels and restaurants.

So the partners we've met with include the Caribbean council, Puerto Rico, the St. Thomas and St. Croix DFW, and several fishing organizations. They raised several potential options during our initial meetings. They're listed up here.

One would be to create an commercial HMS Caribbean small boat permit, would and that be а tuna/swordfish/shark permit limited to Caribbean residents and vessels that are less than, say, a certain size. They also thought that we might be able to combine such a permit

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with dealer permits, which would allow them to harvest and sell.

also recommended that They we partner with PR and the USVI to collect landings data. And that modify the we authorized their gear to better reflect fishery. Obviously, they're using some type of float gear that doesn't meet our handline definition and they also wish to be able to possess fish traps and gill nets and things on board while they have tunas.

We should start to monitor the FAD use as well. I think whatever data collection that we get, we need to start determining if those fish were harvested around or on FADs.

That's about it.

MS. PEEL: I just to share another cautionary note. Ellen Peel, TBF recreational. That we certainly know in the Pacific, you know, with FAD fishing, there are a lot more juvenile billfish that are taken. The proliferation of FADs in the Caribbean is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

causing great concern. We're going to Dominican Republic the end of this month, but they're selling marlin over there that are caught directly on the FADs. So I would be concerned to try to determine whether marlin are being caught in VI, Puerto Rico, and whether those, too, are being sold. How do we control this? Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. I was just wondering what the situation with enforcement was in those regions, and who has jurisdiction, and if there is any enforcement in place, that would be the key issue in decided what regulations you could put in place or how they might be followed after they were put in place.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We have two special agents in Puerto Rico, but none stationed in St. Thomas or St. Croix. The two agents that are in Puerto Rico share the responsibilities of St. Thomas and St. Croix.

MS. JOHNSON: Gail Johnson, fishing

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

We're

Yes.

just

vessel Seneca. This would just be for

U.S. Virgin Islands, is that right?

really doing

Caribbean only and around Puerto Rico and the

discussing stuff. But if we were to move

forward and start analyzing things like this,

yes, it would be limited to the Caribbean and

only to residents in the Caribbean and small

some mainland boats that fish down around that

area. I don't have specific information about

fishing in that area, but I understand that

mainland boats can't fish within a certain

range of Puerto Rico. I don't know if that's

need to make sure that all of our I's are

dotted, T's are crossed, and all that because

it could impact the mainland boats, as well as

true about the U.S. Virgin Islands.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:

it.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. Then there are

1

2

3

4

5

We're

vessels.

not

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the seasonal fishery.

It's been a long time coming.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

But we

1 past member of the ICAT 2 committee and I think of this panel has raised often the fact that artisanal and some other 3 4 fishermen didn't get permits for whatever They're bad, but we end up with this 5 reason. 6 result. So we really do need some avenue of 7 incorporating all those bullets that you had up in here. 8 We also need to make sure that the

mainland boats are accommodated in what's been their customary practice for many years.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It's not our intent to change the way the mainland boats are operating down there. It's mainly to get the smaller vessel operators into the systems so that we can get the catch data from down there.

MR. WHITAKER: Rom Whitaker, Hatteras Charter Boat. My first observation that I see where fish and wildlife is going to put 24 FADs in St. Thomas and I'd sure like to see some off the east coast of U.S.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	My second point is I'm glad to
2	Ellen's on top of the DR thing because there
3	certainly are some bad stories coming from
4	there.
5	MR. HUDSON: Rusty Hudson, Directed
6	Shark Fisheries. Earlier, Greg, you mentioned
7	60,000 recreational vessels in Puerto Rico.
8	U.S. Virgin Island, how many?
9	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
10	[Inaudible.]
11	MR. HUDSON: Okay. Do those, any
12	of those, or some percentage of those double
13	as commercial artisanal fishermen?
14	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
15	[Inaudible.]
16	MR. HUDSON: Okay. Right. Their
17	territorial waters, is that out to 12 miles
18	for both territories? And if so, do most of
19	these small boats fish within the territorial
20	waters or outside of it?
21	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: They're
22	fishing outside. They work the reefs pretty

1	hard and they're moving further off. That's
2	why they're focusing on the FADs. That's why
3	they're placing the FADs. The shelf resources
4	are pretty hammered. So they're looking to
5	the yellow fin tuna.
6	I can't tell you the exact distance
7	of the territorial. I believe it's three.
	1

(DANIEL): Three miles in the USVI and nine nautical miles in Puerto Rico.

last question. MR. **HUDSON:** One With regards to some of the stuff that Bob McCullough, do you know -- the shark is a fairly significant part of their food base it your there for the artisanals, and is intent to try to develop a separate quota that they could fish on even though you're going to try to have them somehow permitted? you know, in essence, that's almost like a whole different ecosystem down there everything.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I image

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Daniel?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we could look at some sort of a set aside. We'd have to I'm sure spend a lot of time looking at that, but that would keep them able to land small amounts year round and not be subject to the closures up here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Greg, I think this is a question I may already know the answer to, but I just want to make sure you're tying with the marine recreational in information program and the characterization of the Caribbean fishery that's going on in I think that's primary private that program. angler and private boat landings, but I'm sure you're tying in with that.

(GREG): Yes. Russ is on the MRIP and we're well aware of what's going on.

MR. AUGUSTINE: Yes. Pat Augustine. Greg, I'm just wondering, for the last prescoping Puerto Rico, a few permitted HMS dealers, should commercial fishermen also hold dealer permits? Is that primarily because they're not reporting all their catch,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	or is it just there are not enough dealers
2	available to handle the products?
3	(GREG): My understanding is there
4	is few people who want to take on the paper
5	work burden of being a dealer.
6	MR. AUGUSTINE: Well, then, to
7	create a paper trail, maybe the recommendation
8	would be to go ahead and commercial when I
9	say commercialized, turn the commercial
10	fishermen into dealers also.
11	MR. FRANKS: Yes. Jim Franks,
12	GCRL. You mentioned, let's see you had eight
13	FADs deployed, 24 planned for St. Thomas. Any
14	idea how many FADs are currently deployed in
15	St. Croix and what the plans there are for
16	future deployment?
17	(GREG): The eight and 24 was for
18	St. Thomas and St. Croix combined. The
19	majority of them are off of St. Croix. I
20	believe on the north and west side. I have a
21	picture of them. There are a few off of St.
22	Thomas and those are mostly off the north

shore.

MR. FRANKS: Okay. Because some of those areas are documented billfish spawning areas. And although Ellen had some concern about the juveniles, of course, you know spawning adults, that's a known problem in the central and southern Caribbean as well and they're having issues with that as to how to resolve those issues, catching spawning marlin around FADs. They're actually fishing for tuna, so they're trying to work on that issue.

So I agree. That is something in your discussion that the FAD issue needs to be addressed because growing numbers of FADs can create reasonably high numbers of bycatch and marlin are not [inaudible]. Something that needs really to be looked at. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just one last comment. The growing number of FADs in the Caribbean is certainly gaining notoriety. When I was in Peru two weeks ago, some of the Ecudorean sport fishing boats that were there,

1	planning on going to Dominican Republic also
2	at the ends of this month, and they're, hey, I
3	hear even not only the artisanals, the
4	commercial and the sport fishing boats are
5	fishing on FADs. So you're really aggregating
6	a lot of fish and probably whacking a lot of
7	them.
8	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, Greg, that
9	was a great presentation on the Caribbean
10	fisheries. I was just wondering if you know
11	if the enforcement agent in St. Thomas was
12	getting close to retirement age?
13	(Laughter.)
14	(GREG): No. They're actually
15	young bucks.
16	MR. GERENCER: Yes. Bill Gerencer,
17	the World. Listen, how confident are you of
18	the landing numbers that you have? I mean
19	based on the fact that so much of that fish
20	gets sold locally or taken in. On your
21	estimates like swordfish, where do you get

those numbers from and how confident are you

about them?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

you were from the national report. Those were the landings that have been reported to us. That stuff came from that landings cards and trip ticket. And, no, I don't think that's all or we wouldn't be here. Our intent is to get that small component that likely adds up to quite a bit over the year. What we do have there is mostly all pelagic longline landings from mainland boats. I don't think we're getting very much of the small scale fishery landings from down there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible.]

(MARGO): Ι guess we'll start tomorrow at 8:30. And just to remind you, at 9:30 we'll have the presentation on greensticks, charter head boats that was scheduled for this morning. So if you could be here at 8:30, we'll get a prompt start and get you out on time around lunch time.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.)

2

1

3

4

5

# **NEAL R. GROSS**